

THE
CHOWKHAMBA SANSKRIT STUDIES
Vol XIX

THE PURĀNA TEXT
OF THE
DYNASTIES OF THE KALI AGE

By
F. E. Pargiter

30727

A. B. L. Awasht

Publisher : The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi-1
Printer : Vidya Vilas Press, Varanasi-1
Edition : Second, 1962.
Price : Rs. 20-00

© The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office
Gopal Mandir Lane, Varanasi-1

(INDIA)

1962

PHONE : 3145

PUBLISHERS' NOTE

It was just half a century ago that Justice Mr. Pargiter put forth his literary finds in respect of dynasties of the rulers of the Kali age culled out from the evidences of the various Purāṇas. His work met with great approbation at the hands of the scholars of the Ancient Indian History and culture and it soon became a valuable book of reference and authority. This work collates extracts from various Paurāṇika texts and adds in the Appendices the author's own interpretations which open a new vista for further researches on the subject. It was published in the year 1913 A. D., and it is now long since that this useful work has been out of stock and print. In order that the present generation of scholars need no more remain bereaved of the privations from this unique work on the dynasties of our early rulers, the Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi, enthused with a zeal to republish such books as have gone rare, took upon themselves the task of bringing out this title, 'The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age'.

The publishers hope that their attempt will serve scholars interested in the study of this branch of Ancient Indian History and also the cause of further researches in the Purāṇas which deserve priority of attention in the matter of their close study and scientific interpretation.

THE PURĀNA TEXT
OF THE
DYNASTIES OF THE KALI AGE

WITH INTRODUCTION AND NOTES

EDITED BY

F. E. PARGITER, M. A.

INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE, RETIRED; LATE JUDGE, HIGH COURT, CALCUTTA

HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

LONDON EDINBURGH GLASGOW NEW YORK TORONTO
MELBOURNE AND BOMBAY

1913

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	V
The Purāṇa authorities, §§ 1, 2.	
The Versions and their characters, §§ 3-6.	
The Bhaviṣya Purāṇa the original authority, §§ 7-9.	
Prophetic form of the account, §§ 10-14.	
Original language of the account, §§ 15-17.	
Age of the compilation of the account—from its subject-matter, §§ 18-25; from the scripts, §§ 26, 27.	
Sanskritization of the account, §§ 28, 29.	
Errors, omissions, and rare verses, §§ 30, 31.	
Formation of this text, §§ 32-36.	
Interpretation of the account—generally, §§ 37, 38; misreadings of letters, §§ 39-41 ; numerals, §§ 42-47.	
Conclusion, §§ 48-54.	
List of Authorities : editions and MSS collated	xxix
Abbreviations	xxxiv
THE PURĀṆA TEXT OF THE DYNASTIES—	
Preface	1
Pauravas (of Hastināpura and Kauśāmbī)	3
Aikṣvākus (of Ayodhyā)	8
Bṛhadrathas (of Magadha)	13
Pradyotas	17
Śiśunāgas	20
Early Contemporary Dynasties	23
Nandas	24
Mauryas	26
Śuṅgas	30

CONTENTS

Kāṇvāyanas (Śuṅgabhrīyas)	33
Andhras	35
Various Local Dynasties	44
Dynasties of Vidiśā, &c.	48
Dynasties of the Third Century, A. D.	50
Contemporary Dynasties of the early Fourth Century	53
Evils of the Kali Age	55
Chronological and Astronomical Particulars	57
TRANSLATION	65
APPENDIXES—	
I. The Account was originally in Prakrit	77
II. The oldest scripts used in the Account	84
III. Janamejaya's dispute with the brāhmaṇas	86
INDEX	89

1. Matsya
2. Vayu
3. Bhmd
4. Vishnu
5. Bhag
6. Cnd
7. Bkhan

INTRODUCTION

Authorities.

Accounts of the dynasties that reigned in India during the Kali age are found in the Matsya, Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa, Viṣṇu, Bhāgavata, Garuḍa, and Bhaviṣya Purāṇas. All these, except the Matsya and Bhāgavata, set out the ancient genealogies down to the time of the great battle between the Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas, and immediately afterwards deal with the dynasties that reigned in North India after that time, of which the three earliest and chief were the Pauravas who reigned at first at Hastināpura and moved in king Nicakṣus' time to Kauśāmbī, the Aikṣvākas who reigned at Ayodhyā, and the Bārhadrathas who reigned in Magadha. But the Matsya and Bhāgavata break these up. The Matsya adds only these later Pauravas to the ancient Paurava line in connexion with the ancient genealogies, and introduces all the rest of the Kali age dynasties separately in some of its latest chapters. The Bhāgavata adds the later Aikṣvākus to the ancient line, and the later Pauravas and Bārhadrathas¹ immediately after the ancient Paurava line in its ninth skandha, and deals with all the subsequent dynasties separately in its twelfth skandha.

i) Pauravas
ii) Aikṣvākas
iii) Bārhadrathas

2. The editions cited in this Introduction are these:—

Matsya and Vāyu, Ānandāśrama editions of 1907 and 1905 (cited as AMt and AVā).

Brahmāṇḍa, Śrī-Veṅkaṭeśvara edition of 1906 (cited as Bd).

Bhāgavata, Ganpat Kṛishṇāji edition of 1889 (cited as GBh)².

Viṣṇu and Garuḍa, Jivānanda Vidyāsāgar's Calcutta editions of 1882 and 1890 (cited as CVs and CGr).

The only copy of the Bhaviṣya that I have seen, containing the dynastic matter, is the Śrī-Veṅkaṭeśvara edition.

The passages containing this dynastic matter are these³:—

AMatsya 50, 57-89, and 271, 1 to 273, 55.

AVāyu 99, 250-435.

Brahmāṇḍa iii, 74, 104-248.

¹ The Bārhadratha line was an offshoot from the Paurava line; see JRAS, 1910, pp. 11, 22, 29, 51.

² The edition begun by Burnouf cannot be adopted for reference, because it does not contain the Sanskrit text of skandha xii.

³ The first few kings of the future Pauravas are named in MBh i, 95, 3835-8 (which agrees with these authorities); and also in Brahma 13, 123-141, and Harivamśa 191, 11063-81 (which are wholly unlike these authorities and are obviously absurd).

INTRODUCTION

CViṣṇu iv, 20, 12 to 24, 44.

GBhāgavata ix, 12, 9-16; 22, 34-49; and xii, 1, 2 to 2, 36.

CGaruda 140, 40 and 141, 1-12.

Bhaviṣya III, i, 3 and 6.

The accounts are in verse in the śloka metre in all except the Viṣṇu, which is mainly in prose except in the final portion.

The Versions and their Characters.

3. The versions of the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa present a remarkable similarity. The two latter agree so closely that they resemble two recensions of the same text, and the Matsya, though not in such marked agreement, contains a text very similar. There can be no doubt that their versions are based upon one original compilation, and this appears from four facts: first, they all declare they are taken from the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa¹; secondly, where the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa differ from each other, one of them not seldom agrees with the Matsya²; thirdly, single MSS of them sometimes vary so as to agree with the reading of the Matsya³; and fourthly, one Purāṇa occasionally omits a verse which appears in one or both of the two others, yet a single MS (or a very few MSS) of it has at times preserved that verse⁴ and so testifies to their original harmony. These three versions therefore grew out of one and the same original text. At the same time the Matsya version has a character of its own which is clearly different from those of the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa, and was prior to those two (see § 24). The similarity of the three is however such that, by collating all their MSS, copious material is available for estimating what the original compilation was. The verse is almost epic. One line is generally assigned to each king, and two or more are sometimes given to the more prominent kings; and it is rare that two kings are dealt with in the same line, except in the early portions of the Paurava, Aikṣvāku, and Bārhadratha dynasties for which the chroniclers' materials were necessarily scanty, and in the latest dynasties which are treated succinctly.

4. The Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata have very much in common and their versions are generally alike, with the differences that the latter is in verse and the former in prose, and that the latter by the exigencies of its metre has less freedom and is often cramped. Both are distinguished from the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa in being much condensed, so that their accounts are often little more than a string of names fitted in with connecting words and occasional terms of relationship; yet they vary at times in important names and particulars so far as to indicate some independence. The Viṣṇu has ślokas at the end of the Paurava and Aikṣvāku dynasties, and the

¹ See § 7.

² Thus the Vāyu agrees with the Matsya in p. 17, l. 32; and the Brahmāṇḍa with the Matsya in p. 22, l. 13. Other instances will be found in the notes.

³ Especially eVā; as to which see *List of Authorities: Vāyu*.

⁴ Thus p. 28, ll. 3, 4 of the Matsya version do not occur in any copy of the Vāyu or Brahmāṇḍa except eVā.

THE BHAVISYA THE ORIGINAL AUTHORITY vii

whole of its final chronological and astronomical portion is in verse; and it cites all these as pre-existing ślokas. The Bhāgavata has at times fuller verses which resemble those of the three Purāṇas, and its final portion agrees largely with that of the Viṣṇu. Wherever the Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata have the fuller form of verse, they agree with or approximate to the version of those three Purāṇas, and so testify that they have been derived from an original which was the same as or closely like the original of those Purāṇas. These peculiarities show that these two are condensed redactions. They are also later, for the Viṣṇu elaborates its prose at times in the ornate classical style especially when referring to Kṛṣṇa-Viṣṇu¹, and the age of the Bhāgavata will be considered further on².

5. The Garuḍa stands by itself, for it gives only the Paurava, Aikṣvāku, and Bārhadraṭha dynasties, and its account of them is merely a string of bare names put into ślokas, more condensed than the Bhāgavata. It is evidently a late version; see Appendix I, § x.

6. The only copy of the Bhaviṣya which contains this dynastic matter is the Venkaṭeśvara edition, but its account is altogether vitiated and worthless. It says each Paurava king reigned at least 1000 years, and Kṣemaka's son was Pradyota (III, i, 3, 82-96); and it declares that Gautama founded Buddhism in Mahānanda's time, that Gautama reigned ten years, and that his successors were Śākyamuni, Śuddhodana, Śākyasiṃha, his son Buddhasiṃha, and his son Candragupta (ibid. 6, 35-43). It dilates, however, on more recent 'history' with elaborate details, and with a great quantity of new matter boldly fabricated brings its prophecies down to the nineteenth century³. In other copies the ancient matter has dropped out, and some very modern events have been particularized⁴.

The Bhaviṣya the Original Authority.

7. The Bhaviṣya is declared to have been the original authority for these dynasties. Both the Matsya and the Vāyu expressly state that their accounts are based upon it. Thus in the Preface the Sūta says he will declare all the future kings—

tān sarvān kīrtayiṣyāmi Bhaviṣye kathitān nṛpān.

This is the Matsya version, and the Vāyu, agreeing, makes it more precise by reading *Bhaviṣye paṭhitān*⁵. Here *Bhaviṣye* cannot mean simply 'in the future', but must mean 'in the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa'. Again, when mentioning the Paurava kings after Adhisimakṛṣṇa's reign, the Sūta introduces them with a verse, of which the second line runs thus according to the Matsya:—

tasyānvavāye vakṣyāmi Bhaviṣye kathitān nṛpān.

¹ It alludes to Kṛṣṇa thus:—Bhagavataḥ sakala-surāsura-vandita-carana-yugalasyāt-mēcchā-karāṇa-mānuṣa-rūpa-dhāriṇo'nubhāvāt (iv, 20, 12).

² See Appendix I, § viii, and Appendix II.

³ See ZDMG, lvii, 276.

⁴ See List of Authorities: *Bhaviṣya*, infra.

⁵ See p. 2, l. 7 and notes thereto. The Brahmanda no doubt had the same line, but it has a large lacuna (see p. 1) and the line has been lost. On the importance of these words see § 23.

INTRODUCTION

The Vāyu agrees, except that it reads *Bhaviṣye tāvato*¹. The Matsya words can mean nothing but 'in the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa', and this is the best rendering of the Vāyu's words also, even if *tāvato* be not a misreading².

8. Again, when citing the genealogical śloka at the end of the Aikṣvāku dynasty, the Vāyu says it was *bhaviṣya-jñair udāhṛtaḥ*, and the Brahmāṇḍa *bhaviṣyaj-jñair udāhṛtaḥ*, but the Matsya says truthfully *viprair gītaḥ purāṇanaiḥ*. Here *bhaviṣya* and *bhaviṣyat* can hardly mean 'future' because the plural is used. Vyāsa alone was supposed to be gifted with foreknowledge, and those men could only repeat what they received from him; but, as the Sūta says he got his knowledge from Vyāsa directly (p. 2), it was futile for him to refer to them as authorities. The best interpretation therefore is that (*bhaviṣya* means the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa, and that *bhaviṣyat* is a perversion of it.) Lastly, in the concluding portion of this account of the Kali age the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa have this line generally:—

Bhaviṣye te prasaṅkhyātāḥ purāṇa-jñaiḥ śrutarsibhiḥ.

* Here also *Bhaviṣye* can only mean 'in the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa'; and that this was the meaning is testified to by two MSS of the Matsya which read the second half line, *purāṇe śruti-sarpibhiḥ*³. These passages therefore prove that the versions of the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa were borrowed from the Bhaviṣya or were at least based on it; and the accounts in the Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata must also have been derived therefrom, because they were later redactions as shown above.

9. The Bhaviṣya therefore as the source of all these accounts should be invaluable in elucidating them; but the copies of it, which I have seen or obtained information about, either do not contain this matter or present it in a wholly corrupted form. It is therefore, as it exists now, of no value for the present purpose and has been left out of consideration. An explanation, how it came to be tampered with, will be offered in connexion with the age of these versions (§ 28).

Prophetic Form of the Account.

10. All these accounts profess to be prophetic, yet the standpoints from which these Purāṇas view these genealogies differ somewhat. The Viṣṇu professes to have been narrated by Parāśara to Maitreya, and sets out the Paurava genealogy from the standpoint of the reign of Abhimanyu's son Parīkṣit, and the Aikṣvāku and Barhadratha genealogies from the time of the great battle between the Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas⁴. This is absurd, because Parāśara was Vyāsa's father and was dead long before that battle and Parīkṣit's birth. All the other Purāṇas profess to have been recited by the Sūta to the rishis in Naimiṣa forest and (except in the Garuḍa) at their twelve-year sacrifice⁵. The Vāyu fixes the time of that sacrifice as the

¹ Not cited in the Preface (see p. 1).

² See also p. 3, note ⁴⁵.

³ See p. 59, 1 10, and note thereto.

⁴ CVs iv, 20, 12-13, and 21, 1: also 22,

1 and 23, 1.

⁵ AMt 1, 4; AVa 1, 13-15; Bḍ i, 1, 17, 18, 35, 36; GBh i, 1, 4-6; CGr 1, 3-11. They differ in the Sūta's name.

PROPHETIC FORM OF THE ACCOUNT

ix

reign of the Paurava king *Asīmakṛṣṇa*¹, who is more often called *Adhisīmakṛṣṇa*², and who was fourth in descent from *Parīkṣit*; and the *Matsya* and *Vāyu* say the same in nearly the same words when mentioning that king in this account of the Kali age³. These two *Purāṇas* thus deal with these genealogies from the standpoint of his reign, and the *Brahmaṇḍa*, *Bhāgavata*, and *Garuḍa* constructively profess to do the same.

11. The *Matsya* and *Vāyu* carry out that view. They bring the Paurava genealogy from *Abhimanyu* and his son *Parīkṣit* down to *Adhisīmakṛṣṇa* as already past, and name *Adhisīmakṛṣṇa* as the reigning king⁴; the rishis then inquire about the Kali age, and the *Sūta*, declaring his intention to set out all the future kings, begins the list of future Pauravas from that monarch. Similarly, in the contemporary *Aikṣvāku* and *Bārhadhratha* genealogies, these two *Purāṇas* name *Divākara* as reigning then in *Ayodhyā* and *Senājit* in *Magadha*⁵, and mention their predecessors as past and their successors as future. Hence they virtually declare that these three kings were contemporary⁶. The position taken in the *Brahmaṇḍa* is the same, though it is obscured by a large lacuna in which all the Paurava and *Aikṣvāku* kings are lost, and its account begins with line 23 on page 12. Thenceforward it agrees with the *Matsya* and *Vāyu* and mentions *Senājit* as the reigning *Bārhadhratha* king. The *Bhāgavata* and *Garuḍa*, though professing to have been recited in *Adhisīmakṛṣṇa*'s reign, take the former the standpoint of *Parīkṣit*'s reign⁷, and the latter that of his son *Janamejaya*⁸; and both treat all the successors and also all the *Aikṣvāku* and *Bārhadhratha* kings after the great battle as future. The *Viṣṇu* agrees with the *Bhāgavata* in this attitude, as already mentioned.

12. Accordingly the texts are framed for the most part in prophetic shape, but this character is not maintained completely because past expressions occur here and there, such as *abharat*⁹, *smṛta*¹⁰, &c. Some MSS have tried to be more consistent by modifying such words¹¹. One line found in three MSS frankly states that the whole *Aikṣvāku* dynasty was ancient, and naturally does not appear in any of the other MSS¹². There can be no doubt therefore that the accounts have been steadily though slowly revised in details, so as to improve their prophetic character.

¹ In its verse, 1, 12—

Asīmakṛṣṇe vikrānte rājany an-upama-tviṣi
praśāsati mām dharmena bhūmim bhūmipa-sattame.

² See p. 4, note ¹⁰.

³ *AMt* 50, 66, 67; *AVā* 99, 258, 259.

⁴ See p. 4, l. 6.

⁵ See p. 10, l. 5, and p. 15, l. 13.

⁶ In equating these kings some 20 years must be prefixed to the Paurava list on account of *Yudhiṣṭhira*'s reign after the

great battle, before *Parīkṣit* came to the throne, see § 14.

⁷ *GBh* ix, 1, 6.

⁸ *CGr* 140, 40.

⁹ *E.g.* p. 10, note ²³; p. 11, l. 18.

¹⁰ *E.g.* p. 5, l. 11; p. 11, ll. 14, 21.

¹¹ *E.g. bhavet* for *abharat*, p. 10, note ²³; p. 11, note ⁵¹.

¹² P. 12, l. 26. It is no doubt genuine, for no one would be likely to fabricate and interpolate it to mar the prophecy.

INTRODUCTION

13. Though the account is said to have been narrated to Paurava kings or to ṛishis in Naimiṣa forest, yet the ground from which the historic changes are viewed is Magadha. The Paurava and Aikṣvāku dynasties are dealt with briefly, with two kings generally to a line and with no mention of the lengths of the reigns, but the Bārhadraṭha dynasty of Magadha is set out with one line to each king and the length of his reign is stated¹. After those three ancient kingdoms disappeared, the dynasties treated of are those which reigned in or dominated Magadha. All other dynasties in North India are noticed only in the aggregate, with the exception of the dynasty of Vidiṣā, and even that is described but cursorily (p. 49).

14. The beginning of the Kali age has been discussed by Dr. Fleet, and he has pointed out that it began on the day on which Kṛṣṇa died, which the chronology of the Mahābhārata places, as he shows, some twenty years after the great battle, and that it was then that Yudhiṣṭhira abdicated and Parikṣit began to reign². But, as shown above, these Purāṇas virtually begin the Kali age dynasties immediately after the battle, and that position is the most convenient to adopt for the present purpose. The text of the Matsya and Vāyu³ can be brought into harmony therewith by merely altering the order of a few verses without tampering with them, namely, by transposing the four verses containing the ṛishis' questions and the prefatory verses of the Sūta's reply from their position in Adhisimākṛṣṇa's reign to the commencement of the account; and, so treated, those verses form a fitting preface to the whole: but it is unnecessary to print the questions here, and those prefatory verses are alone introduced as a sufficient preface (see p. 1).

Original Language of the Account.

15. There are clear indications that the Sanskrit account as it exists in the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa was originally in Prakrit, or, more accurately, that it is a Sanskritized version of older Prakrit ślokas. The indications are these: *first*, certain passages as they stand now in Sanskrit violate the śloka metre, whereas in Prakrit form they would comply with the metre; *secondly*, certain Prakrit words actually occur, especially where they are required by the metre, which the corresponding Sanskrit forms would violate; *thirdly*, Sanskrit words occur at times in defiance of syntax, whereas the corresponding Prakrit forms would make the construction correct; *fourthly*, mistaken Sanskritizations of names; *fifthly*, the copious use of expletive particles; and *sixthly*, irregular sandhi.

16. A full examination of these peculiarities would overload this Introduction, and the proof of them has therefore been set out in Appendix I. The above conclusion holds good for the whole of the text of the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa;

¹ The *Early Contemporary Dynasties* summarize all except the Māgadhas (p. 23).

² JRAS, 1911, pp. 479, 675, 686; and p. 62, l. 37 *infra*. Hence in equating the Paurava kings with the Aikṣvāku and Bār-

hadraṭha kings, some 20 years must be prefixed to the former.

³ This portion in the Brahmāṇḍa is lost in the lacuna, as already mentioned.

ORIGINAL LANGUAGE OF THE ACCOUNT

xi

their verses are older Prakrit ślokas Sanskritized. It also holds good for such portions of the Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata as have preserved the old verses; but the main portions of these two Purāṇas are condensed redactions composed directly in Sanskrit. The Garuḍa version is a more concise condensation composed directly in Sanskrit apparently. These conclusions are explained in Appendix I.

17. Judging from such specimens of old ślokas and Prakritisms as have survived, it would appear that the Prakrit used in the original ślokas was a literary language not far removed from Sanskrit¹. The art of writing was introduced into India some seven centuries B.C., and there can be no doubt that it must have been adopted early in the Courts because of its manifest administrative usefulness. Records must have been kept by secretaries and chroniclers in the royal offices, and as those men would not always have been Sanskrit scholars, the language they used would presumably have been as elegant a Prakrit as their courtly surroundings and predilections required. There must have been ample written material concerning the dynasties from the 7th century B.C. from which metrical chronicles could have been composed by bards, minstrels, and reciters² in the same kind of language, to entertain not only their royal and noble patrons but also all those who found an interest in hearing of former times³. As Magadha was a great, if not the chief, centre of political activity during those ages, we can perceive how it was that the account grew up with Magadha as its centre (§ 13). The Māgadhās were celebrated as minstrels, and since traditions are most easily remembered, are best handed down, and confer the greatest pleasure, when cast into poetical form, it is easy to understand how this metrical account of the dynasties in literary Prakrit could have developed among them. Hence we may infer that the original ślokas were composed in Māgadhī; or, since the account, much as we have it now, was compiled and edited apparently in North India⁴, and one verse that the Bhāgavata has preserved is in Pali⁵, they may have been in Pali, either originally or perhaps more probably by conversion.

¹ Pali is such a language, and other specimens are found in the early inscriptions.

² Sūtas, māgadhās, and vandins; and other professional singers.

³ Such men have existed in India from early times, and a graphic account of them, their methods, popularity, and influence, will be found in Babu Dinesh Chandra Sen's excellent 'History of Bengali Language and Literature', pp. 162-7, 584-5, 588-90. Since the brahmins could and did transmit the Vedic hymns with verbal accuracy for many hundreds of years, there is no improbability in supposing that bards and minstrels could hand down metrical accounts of dynasties with substantial though not

with verbal accuracy. As these bards and minstrels existed in all parts of North India, they were a check on one another in the transmission of tradition, and there are indications that the Purāṇic traditions of the dynastic genealogies were compiled with some attempt to ascertain the truth. Moreover there was no objection to the accounts being written down, as soon as writing came into general use; and that would have been also a check on variation.

⁴ See § 27.

⁵ See Appendix I, § ii. Certain other words mentioned in Appendix I appear to be Pali.

INTRODUCTION

Age of the Compilation of the Account.

18. The account supplies two kinds of internal evidence to fix the time when it was compiled, namely, *first*, the subject matter, and *secondly*, textual peculiarities; and both are important. The latter are dealt with in § 26, and the former is discussed first. The subject matter consists of two parts, the earlier setting out the dynastic details, and the later part describing the unhappy conditions that should prevail and stating certain chronological and astronomical particulars¹. These are treated here separately.

19. The dynastic portion shows two stages of termination. The earlier of these stages is the period following the downfall of the Andhras and the local kingdoms that survived them a while. The Matsya account ends here with the mere mention of the Kilakila kings², and no MS of the Matsya contains anything later. The Andhra kingdom fell about A.D. 236, and it may be said that the Matsya account brings the historical narrative down to about the middle of the third century A.D. and no further.

20. The Vāyu, Brahmanḍa, Viṣṇu, and Bhāgavata all carry the narrative on to the rise of the Guptas, which is the later stage. The Guptas are mentioned as reigning over the country comprised within Prayāga, Sāketa (Ayodhyā), and Magadha, that is, exactly the territory which was possessed at his death by Candragupta I who founded the Gupta dynasty in A.D. 319-20 and reigned till 326 or 330 (or even till 335 perhaps), before it was extended by the conquests of his son and successor Samudragupta. With the Guptas are mentioned Nāgas, Manidhānyas, and others as reigning contemporaneously over the countries which surrounded the Gupta territory³ and which were subjugated afterwards by Samudragupta⁴. The account takes no notice of his conquests nor of the Gupta empire. These particulars show clearly that this account was closed during the interval which elapsed between the time when Candragupta I established his kingdom from Magadha over Tirhut, Bihar, and Oudh as far as Allahabad⁵, and the beginning of Samudragupta's reign, for he began his conquests immediately after his accession. That interval is approximately A.D. 320-330 or perhaps 335. It is hardly credible that, if this account was compiled later, it would have omitted to notice Samudragupta's conquests, or would have mentioned the foregoing kingdoms (which he subdued) in the same terms as his kingdom. The Gupta era was established in A.D. 320, and it may be concluded that this account was closed soon after the commencement of that era, or, if we allow some margin for delay, by the year A.D. 335.

21. Hence it appears that the versified chronicles were first collected about or

¹ The earlier part pp. 1-55, and the later pp. 55 ff.

² That is J. 15 on p. 48. The Vṣ says they were Yavanas, see note ⁶² thereto.

³ See pp. 53-5.

⁴ V. Smith's *History*, 2nd edn. pp. 267-9; and JRAS, 1909, p. 342.

⁵ V. Smith's *History*, p. 266.

AGE OF THE COMPILATION OF THE ACCOUNT xiii

soon after the middle of the 3rd century¹ in the shape found in the Matsya, and that they were extended to the rise of the Gupta kingdom before the year 335, which augmented compilation is what the Vāyu and Brahmandā contain and the Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata have condensed. It has been shown that the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmandā all obtained their accounts from the Bhaviṣya. Hence it would appear that the earlier compilation must have been incorporated in the Bhaviṣya about or soon after the middle of the 3rd century, and that its prophetic account was extended in the later compilation before the year 335. There is nothing improbable in this augmentation, because the Bhaviṣya account has been continually supplemented even up to the present time in order to keep its prophecies up to date, as shown above (§ 6). It follows then that the Bhaviṣya must have been in existence in the middle of the 3rd century²; and it would appear that the Matsya borrowed what the Bhaviṣya contained before the Gupta era, and that the Vāyu and Brahmandā borrowed the Bhaviṣya's augmented account about or soon after the year 330 or 335. Further remarks on these dates are offered in §§ 43 ff.

22. Further light is thrown on these points by the MS eVāyu, which contains the full account but holds a position intermediate between the general Vāyu version and the Matsya version. The facts to be explained are these. The Matsya has one version which contains only the shorter compilation, the Vāyu generally has a somewhat different version containing the full account, the Brahmandā has the full compilation in a version resembling the Vāyu closely, eVāyu has a version containing the full compilation in a text intermediate between the Matsya and all other copies of the Vāyu³, and yet all these Purāṇas declare they borrowed their accounts from the Bhaviṣya. ✕ 9

23. The only theory which appears to me to explain all these facts is this. The Matsya borrowed from the Bhaviṣya the shorter account about (say) the last quarter of the 3rd century. The Bhaviṣya account was then extended down to the time when the Gupta kingdom had acquired the territories assigned to it, and its language was revised⁴; that would be (say) about 320-325. The Vāyu copied that extended and revised account from the Bhaviṣya almost immediately, and that is the version found in eVāyu. Afterwards, the language of the Bhaviṣya version was revised again, and this must have been done very soon, (say) about 330-335, before the Gupta kingdom had developed into the Gupta empire by Samudragupta's conquests, because it could hardly have failed to notice that immense change if the revision had been later. This second revision was soon adopted by the Vāyu and is the version found now in Vāyu MSS generally. The fact that

¹ There is an apparent indication that a compilation was begun in the latter part of the 2nd century in the Andhra king Yajñaśrī's reign, for 5 MSS of the Matsya (of which three appear to be independent, namely, b, c, and d) speak of him as reigning in his ninth or tenth year; see p. 42, note⁸.

If so, the Bhaviṣya may perhaps have existed in that century.

² But not of course in its present condition.

³ The position of eVā is best shown in the account of the Mauryas, pp. 27-9.

⁴ This, as already pointed out, is what has been habitually done to it.

INTRODUCTION

eVāyu stands unique among all the *Vāyu* MSS suggests that no long interval could have separated the second revision from the first, and that the first revised version was quickly superseded by the second in the *Vāyu*. I cannot speak about the *Brahmāṇḍa* in any detail, because I have not been able to collate any MSS of it: yet two points may be noticed, *first*, it agrees closely with the general *Vāyu* version¹ and yet condenses the account sometimes²; and *secondly*, the probability is that it borrowed the second revised version from the *Bhaviṣya* not long after the *Vāyu* adopted that³. The *Bhaviṣya* existed in writing when the first revision appeared in it, because *eVāyu*, as well as all other *Vāyu* MSS, uses the word *paṭhita* when acknowledging its indebtedness to the *Bhaviṣya* (see § 7). The *Matsya* uses the word *kathita* in the corresponding passage, which might imply that it borrowed the account orally at the earlier stage, but that is not probable because of the inferences brought out in Appendix II.

24. If this explanation be tenable, the *Matsya* version of these dynasties of the *Kali* age is older than those of the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa*⁴, and *eVāyu* gives us the earliest text of the *Vāyu*. The styles of the versions appear to support this explanation, for the *Matsya* version is somewhat crude at times, and the *Vāyu* text has been revised more than the *Matsya* as shown by the story of king *Janamejaya's* dispute with the brahmins⁵. Though later than the *Matsya*, the *Vāyu* account may yet be more accurate at times by reason of the revision which it underwent⁶. The *Vāyu* has *Prakritisms* sometimes where the *Matsya* has correct Sanskrit⁷, but this fact is not incompatible with that conclusion, and for either or both of two reasons; (1) the *Matsya* may have emended such defects at the time of taking the account from the *Bhaviṣya*, while the *Vāyu* may have copied them as they stood; and (2) a process of silent emendation has been in continual operation in the MSS⁸. Further it would seem that the three accounts may have been compared at times, for this would explain certain small variations which appear occasionally between the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa* in the direction of the *Matsya*⁹.

¹ The agreement is not only here, but large portions also of the *Brahmāṇḍa* are almost identical with the *Vāyu*.

² As in p. 22, note ⁴⁶; p. 35, note ⁴². In those passages the *Bhāgavata* partially resembles it, and may have copied from it.

³ Unless (what is possible) the *Brahmāṇḍa* copied its account from the *Vāyu* (see note ¹); and its paraphrase of *Aśoka-vardhanaḥ* as *aśokānām ca tṛpti-dah*, if not a late attempted emendation of a text that was unintelligible, suggests that it could not have been composed until *Aśoka* was wholly forgotten.

⁴ I differ therefore from Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, who estimated (without giving reasons) the *Vāyu* account to be older than the *Matsya*; but agree with him that the *Viṣṇu*

is later and the *Bhāgavata* the latest: *Early History of the Deccan*, 1895, p. 162. In all this discussion I am dealing only with the time when these accounts of the dynasties of the *Kali* age were incorporated in these *Purāṇas*, and not with the age of these *Purāṇas* themselves such as they were in that early period; see § 28, note.

⁵ See Appendix III.

⁶ As in the arrangement of verses (see pp. 27, 44), and in many of the readings in the concluding portion (pp. 55 ff).

⁷ See Appendix I, § iii, first instance.

⁸ E.g. p. 18, note ⁷; see Appendix I, § ii.

⁹ These conclusions do not imply that these *Purāṇas* existed then in their present

AGE OF THE COMPILATION OF THE ACCOUNT xv

25. The second portion of the account referred to in § 18 consists of (1) an exposition of the evils of the Kali age, and (2) a chronological-astronomical summary of the age, and is found in the *Matsya*, *Vāyu*, and *Brahmāṇḍa*. This second portion therefore existed in the earliest version compiled soon after the middle of the 3rd century, yet with a difference. While the *Matsya* has a good deal of the exposition, the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa* version contains some 32 more lines and is nearly twice as long as the *Matsya*; so that a large addition was made at the revision, and it was made mostly at the first revision, because the account in *Vāyu* has the full description with the exception of a few verses which may have been omitted by oversight. As regards the chronological-astronomical summary however, all three *Purāṇas* practically agree, the *Matsya* wanting only two lines. These particulars therefore were complete in the first compilation and were not added to in the revisions; and this conclusion is corroborated by the fact that this summary in all three *Purāṇas* brings the reckoning down definitely only to the end of the *Andhras*, and uses the vague term *Andhr-ānt-ādyaś* in referring to future kings¹. No addition was therefore made to it at the revisions to bring it down to the *Gupta* era. It belongs then to the middle of the 3rd century and must be interpreted accordingly; and it shows that the *Saptarsi* cycle of 2700 years was known and was in use in India at that time, that is, about three centuries earlier than has been supposed². The treatment of these two subjects, the evils of the Kali age and the chronological-astronomical particulars, affords an excellent illustration of what the revisers did and did not do. They had no knowledge with which to augment or alter those particulars and so left them unmodified; but the deterioration of the Kali age was a subject congenial to pessimistic brahmanic views and they freely availed themselves of the opportunity of dilating upon it.

26. I come now to the subject of textual peculiarities mentioned in § 18. Further information may be discovered by examining the divergent readings of the same passage and especially the corruptions in names. A study of the variations shows that ordinarily the copyists copied what they found in dull good faith to the best of their ability, often writing the same name differently in contiguous lines³. Moreover these dynasties of *śūdras* and foreigners offered little inducement to readers to alter the texts. Hence the variations that crept in were mostly due to clerical blunders or to misreadings of the MSS copied; and the mistake might be detected and corrected, or might not. If not detected, the erroneous letter remained; if detected, the correct letter was written or inserted, and the incorrect letter was sometimes cancelled but was not seldom left uncanceled. In that state

shape. They have no doubt been freely added to since, see § 28, note.

¹ P. 58, ll. 9, 12, and p. 61, l. 23.

² See *Encycl. Brit.*, 'Hindu Chronology'.

³ Cf. the corruptions in the well-known names, *Kauśāmbī* (p. 5, note¹⁹) and *Kāṇvāyana* (p. 34, note¹¹). Yet sometimes errors

were caused by a droll perversity or would-be cleverness, cf. p. 41, note²⁰; p. 42, note¹; and p. 47, note⁷¹; and sometimes where the text had become corrupt, it was boldly paraphrased afresh, cf. p. 26, note⁴²; p. 33, note²²; but the latter was probably the effort of a reader and not of a copyist.

INTRODUCTION

the passage was repeated in subsequent copies, and misreadings are important chronologically if we can explain how they arose. If their divergent readings of the same name or passage be written in the ancient scripts, and resemble one another so closely in a particular script that an ordinary copyist might easily misread one for another, it may be inferred that the variation must have arisen out of a MS written in that script, and therefore that the text once existed in that script, that is, it had been written during the time when that script was in use. In this way it may be ascertained which are ancient and which are mediaeval or even modern corruptions. Most of the variations have arisen from misreadings of the Gupta and later scripts¹, but for the present purpose it is unnecessary to consider any that arose from misreading scripts that came into use after A.D. 330, the date when this account was finally compiled, and it is only essential to see whether any variations point to misreadings of Kharoṣṭhī or of Brāhmī.

27. It would overload this Introduction to examine such particulars here, and in Appendix II are noticed such cases as appear to throw light on this subject. It is shown there that errors are found in the Matsya, Vāyu, and Viṣṇu which point to misreadings of Kharoṣṭhī as their source. Hence it seems there is reasonable ground for inferring that this account of the dynasties was, in its earliest form, written in Sanskrit in Kharoṣṭhī, and, since Kharoṣṭhī was current only in Upper India, that the account was probably put together there: that is, since the earliest account was in the Bhaviṣya, that the Bhaviṣya account was written originally in Kharoṣṭhī and was put together in Upper India. If these conclusions are sound, it would follow that the account could not have been compiled later than about A.D. 330, because Kharoṣṭhī went out of use about that time. Further, judging from the point of view displayed in the portion which was added to the Bhaviṣya to bring it up to date about the year 320², it would seem that the composers of this portion were probably in Madhyadeśa, and more particularly perhaps in the country between Magadha and Mathurā. The Viṣṇu account was probably based on the same original for three reasons: (1) its dynastic matter agrees closely with that in the Vāyu and Brahmanḍa, and also the ślokas where it has preserved them; (2) it closes its account where they close theirs; and (3) it is not probable that its account was a new and independent compilation from early chronicles when the compilations in the Bhaviṣya, Matsya, and Vāyu were available. At the same time it was composed early enough for its account to be drawn from Kharoṣṭhī MSS. It seems probable then that the main part of the Viṣṇu which is in prose was composed from those Purāṇas directly in Sanskrit not very long after the Gupta era, (say) perhaps before the end of the 4th century. The Bhāgavata was, as shown in Appendix II, composed afresh in Sanskrit, except in so far as it has incorporated old slokas; and must have been based on the same materials for the same three reasons mentioned above, yet most probably on the Viṣṇu chiefly, to which it has

¹ Many such may be detected in the notes, such as mistakes of *p* and *y*, *n* and *r*, *l* and *n*, *r* and *v*, *c* and *v*, &c.

² See §§ 19-21.

SANSKRITIZATION OF THE ACCOUNT

xvii

the closest resemblances¹, and it was probably not composed till the 8th century or even later. These conclusions strictly refer only to these dynastic accounts.

Sanskritization of the Account.

28. It has been shown that the account was first compiled for the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa about the middle of the 3rd century A.D., and there are reasons why that was appropriate. Since royal genealogies constituted one of the subjects which every Purāṇa should treat of, the Bhaviṣya, as a work professing to deal with the future, could hardly ignore the dynasties that reigned after his time; and the dynasties of the Kali age would hold the same position in it that the ancient genealogies held in the Purāṇas which dealt with ancient stories². The account of

¹ See p. 18, note⁷; p. 25, notes^{8, 10, 22}; p. 28, note³⁰; and in its description of the evils of the Kali age, where the Viṣṇu and it have matter peculiar to themselves. It has resemblances to the Brahmāṇḍa in p. 22, note⁴⁶; p. 35, note⁴²; p. 41, note⁵⁰.

² The title Purāṇa indicates that such works narrated ancient stories, but the Bhaviṣya professed by its name to treat of the future, and the title Bhaviṣya Purāṇa is a contradiction in terms. Such a name could hardly have been possible, until the title Purāṇa had become so thoroughly specialized as to have lost its old meaning and become the designation of the kind of works now known by this title. The name Bhaviṣya Purāṇa therefore proves that the kind of composition that passed under the title Purāṇa had become stereotyped before the title could have been assumed by the Bhaviṣya; that is, that genuine Purāṇas must have preceded it so long before as to have specialized the title Purāṇa. It has been shown above that the Bhaviṣya existed in the middle of the 3rd century, hence some at least, if not many, of the true Purāṇas must be considerably older. This inference does not, of course, mean that the Purāṇas contained at their beginning all that they contain now, because there can be no doubt that they have been freely added to since. It is highly probable that they consisted at first mainly of ancient stories, genealogies, ballads, &c., which formed the popular side of ancient literature, and were quite probably in Prakrit originally. In fact, it seems to me that they were largely

in an old literary Prakrit used by the higher classes, but that, as the spoken languages diverged in time more and more from Sanskrit through political vicissitudes, that literary Prakrit became unintelligible, while Sanskrit remained the only polished language of brahmanic Hinduism. Hence it was natural that this literature should be Sanskritized, if it was to be preserved, a process that was not difficult because the old literary Prakrit was not far removed from Sanskrit, yet it was not always effected completely, especially in poetry where the necessity of preserving the metre sometimes qualified that process, and hence Prakrit forms might survive embedded in good Sanskrit as *pravartayitvā* in p. 88, l. 14. It was the brahmins probably who saved and improved the status of those old compositions by converting them into Sanskrit, and afterwards, perceiving what an excellent means they provided for reaching popular thought, made use of them to propagate their own views and doctrines by freely augmenting them with brahmanical fables, philosophical discussions, and ceremonial expositions which were enforced with the authority of Vyāsa. I should say therefore, speaking generally, that what may be called the kṣatriya, or better perhaps the popular, matter of the Purāṇas constituted the really old and genuine *purāṇa*, and that the brahmanical and ritual matters now found in them were later additions and interpolations made from time to time. This inference is based on the fact that it is in the former portion of the Purāṇas that peculiarities occur such as are

C

these dynasties would then naturally have been required for the Bhaviṣya, and all that was necessary was to collect the Prakrit metrical chronicles and convert them into Sanskrit prophecies uttered by Vyāsa¹. That was done as shown in Appendix I, and then the Matsya first, and the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa afterwards, borrowed the account from the Bhaviṣya. The original Bhaviṣya account has been lost, but these three Purāṇas have preserved and reveal what its contents were; otherwise it would have been impossible to know what it contained at that time. A comparison of their accounts with the present condition of the Bhaviṣya shows to what bold lengths pious fraud has gone.

29. Since the chronicles existed in the form of ślokas in literary Prakrit, all that was necessary was (1) to convert the Prakrit words into Sanskrit, and (2) substitute futures for past tenses, while maintaining the śloka metre. The first process appears to have been made word by word as nearly as possible², and the Sanskritization was crude as the many Prakritisms noticed in Appendix I indicate, for they must have existed in the Bhaviṣya account, otherwise it is difficult to see how they could appear in the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa. Indeed it would almost seem that the Bhaviṣya account may have been composed in a literary Prakrit rather than in true Sanskrit. Both processes of conversion would have upset the metre, since Prakrit words are sometimes a syllable longer or shorter than their Sanskrit equivalents, and future tenses are generally longer than past tenses; hence three correctives were adopted; (1) words were dropped which might be omitted without impairing the sense, such as 'reigned', 'years', &c.; (2) compensatory expletives were inserted; and (3) the sentence was occasionally recast³. Still the Sanskritization was imperfect and sometimes grammar or metre was sacrificed, and these blemishes have persisted, as pointed out in Appendix I, in spite of attempts to rectify them afterwards.

noticed in Appendix I. It seems highly probable too that it was largely through the Purāṇic literature, that brahmanism re-established itself over the people and secured the revival of Hinduism and the downfall of Buddhism. That was what actually appened in Bengal and has been called by abu Dinesh Chandra Sen the 'Pauranik Renaissance', which he has described very clearly in his excellent work 'The History of Bengali Language and Literature' (ch. iv).

¹ This was, as has been pointed out above, the beginning of a pious fraud, whereby the prophetic matter has been continually revised and brought up to date in the Bhaviṣya. To be able to point to such prophetic accounts in the literature would have been

a valuable weapon, moreover, in the hands of the brahmins against adversaries of other creeds; and it may be noted in this connexion, that the Venkateśvara edition of the Bhaviṣya has incorporated a summary of the Biblical account from Adam to Abraham in the early chapters of Genesis (Bhav. iii, 4, 17-19, 29-60; 5, 1-20). There can hardly be any doubt that this interpolation has been made very recently in view of Christianity.

² See the phrase *aṣṭāviṃśati tathā varṣā* in Appendix I, § i.

³ Cf. for instance the lines in the *Andhras* where the two versions are given, and the notes thereto.

ERRORS, OMISSIONS, AND RARE VERSES

xix

Errors, omissions, and rare verses.

30. Though there was originally one text common (but qualified by the revisions suggested in § 23) to the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa down to the end of the Andhras, yet present MSS show many errors and omissions and some misplacements. Such defects easily occurred through the carelessness of copyists¹, damage to² or loss of³ leaves, or disarrangement of leaves⁴. The blemishes in the text appear to have been generally accidental. The brahmins who compiled the Sanskrit account could and did fabricate passages portraying the evils of the Kali age, but had neither inclination nor incentive to invent particular dynasties or kings of foreign or base origin. The chief changes that can be placed under the head of fabrications are various attempts by later readers to improve the text in details in which it appeared to be corrupt or inelegant⁵, or to remove inconsistencies⁶. Among the latter some alterations, though made apparently in good faith, involved tampering with the text, as in the Śiśunāga dynasty, where the Matsya, by mistakenly introducing the first two Kāṇvāyana kings, names twelve kings instead of ten as all the other authorities declare; so that some copies of the Matsya have boldly altered the total to twelve, while others more cautiously have made the passage indefinite⁷. Misreadings have also produced incorrect statements and there are many errors in names and numbers⁸; but of deliberate falsification I have found no instance except in the story of the dispute between Janamejaya and the brahmins⁹.

31. It is reasonably certain, then, that in the main these versions have suffered from nothing but carelessness and accident, and considering what little interest this account could have for educated readers, especially those brahmanically-minded, the text has been fairly well preserved. Much may have been lost altogether, for some passages have almost disappeared. One Purāṇa, or even one MS only, has preserved a passage or verse sometimes which is wanting in all the rest: thus eVāyu, alone of all the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa MSS,

¹ As for instance the mistaken introduction of the first two Kāṇvāyana kings among the Śiśunāgas in the Matsya (see p. 21 and note²⁴).

² Damage probably explains the frequent loss of verses here and there in different MSS.

Hence no doubt the absence of all the first part in the Brahmāṇḍa (see pp. 1, 3, 8).

As for instance the displacement in eVāyu of the last half of the Early Contemporary Dynasties, all the Nandas, Mauryas, Śuṅgas, and Kāṇvāyanas and the first twelve lines of the Andhras after Viśvasphāni

(see pp. 23, 24, 27, 30, 33, 35, 50).

⁵ See p. 26, note⁴²; p. 33, note⁵²; p. 52 notes^{37, 38, 42}.

⁶ As in p. 29, note³².

⁷ See p. 22, note⁴³.

⁸ As where the Bh misread *trayodaśa* as *bhūyo daśa*, p. 46, note²². As regards the readings *Tuṣāra* and *Tukhāra* in pp. 45, 47, it may be noted that *s* has often been pronounced *kh* for centuries in North India, and that the letter *ś* was used at times for *kh*; hence these two letters are often confused: cf. p. 6, notes^{32, 43}; p. 19, note²⁹ p. 41, note⁸⁰; p. 51, note²⁴; &c.

⁹ See Appendix III.

INTRODUCTION

contains the verse about Śālīsūka, and his existence might be doubted if it depended on that alone, but it is testified to by the Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata¹. Again in the Bhāgavata only one copy has preserved the verse about Suśarman². Such being the conditions, no verse should be discarded even if it is found in only one MS. Thus line 26 of the Aikṣvākus appears only in three MSS, and lines 12-14 of the Preface only in eVāyu; yet it is not credible that they were fabricated, and they might easily have been regarded as valueless in the other MSS, for the former contradicts the alleged prophetic standpoint, and the latter merely name sundry and some unknown dynasties. Such rare passages appear to be relics of genuine tradition; and it is possible that lines 30, 31 of the Bārhadhrathas found only in jMatsya, and line 28 of the Andhras found only in eVāyu, may be genuine. Other peculiar verses will be found in the notes³.

Formation of this Text.

32. The Bhaviṣya account having been the common source of the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa versions, the various readings are often equivalent or not materially different, so that real divergencies are far fewer than the places where the readings vary. The text now offered has been prepared according to the printed editions and the MSS collated. The Matsya and Vāyu versions are of far greater value than the Brahmāṇḍa, because they have been printed at Calcutta and in the Ānandāśrama series from a number of MSS, and I have collated besides 13 MSS of the Matsya and 11 of the Vāyu; whereas of the Brahmāṇḍa only the Venkateśvara edition has been available⁴, and I have seen no MSS containing this account. Where variations occur I have endeavoured to choose the most weighty, it being remembered (1) that the Matsya gives us the oldest version, eVāyu the next, and all other copies of the Vāyu and the Brahmāṇḍa the third recension; and (2) that the Matsya is at times a somewhat crude Sanskritization of the old Prakrit ślokas, and the later versions may be more accurate. Their general agreement must be understood, but variations and omissions are always noticed, so that where no notes are given, the copies all agree.

33. The Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata cannot elucidate that common version except in the occasional passages where they adhere to it; and there they have been used to frame the text. Otherwise they can only help towards determining the correct names of the kings and the duration of the dynasties, and are so utilized in the notes. The Bhāgavata is also useful in determining the order of the kings, because, while the single lines devoted to individual kings might be and have been displaced at times in the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa, its versified lists preclude the

¹ P. 29, l. 10. He is also mentioned in the *Gārgīśānkhita* according to Max Müller in 'India: what can it teach us?' (ed. 1883) p. 298; but the passage is spurious, see JRAS, 1912, pp. 792-3.

² See p. 34, note¹⁹.

³ As p. 40, l. 13; p. 42, note³.

⁴ See *List of Authorities, Brahmāṇḍa Purāna*.

FORMATION OF THIS TEXT

xxi

shifting of names in a verse, and the disarrangement of lines would produce manifest disarrangement of groups of kings. Besides the Calcutta edition of the Viṣṇu and the Gaṇpat edition of the Bhāgavata, I have collated 10 MSS of the former and 18 of the latter, and also the French edition of the Bhāgavata so far as its Sanskrit text goes.

34. The Garuḍa is of use only for the names of the kings in the three earliest dynasties, and I have been able to collate only the Calcutta edition and two MSS. The Venkateśvara edition of the Bhaviṣya is of no value as already explained.

35. As regards variations in words, these when small, such as errors in sandhi¹, or optional ways of writing², or obvious clerical mistakes³, or mere trivial differences⁴, are generally disregarded or corrected unless there is something noteworthy in them⁵, for many of the MSS are carelessly written and abound in such blemishes; yet the notes will show that I have erred probably rather on the side of inclusion than of exclusion. Various letters are often written so much alike in the MSS as to be easily confused, such as *b* and *v*, *p* and *y*, *c* and *v*, *n* and *l*, *n* and *r*, subscript *r* and *n*, and the MSS often contain superfluous letters written by mistake and not cancelled. These flaws, when obviously purely clerical, have been disregarded in some cases, but otherwise, and especially where these particulars may prove significant in the matter of Prakritisms and scripts, have been cited in the notes as they stand, the superfluous letters being enclosed in square brackets. *B* and *v* when not distinguished in the MSS have been generally transcribed as they should be correctly, unless the actual letter seemed worthy of notice. Since the account is only a Sanskritized version of Prakrit ślokas, Prakrit forms have been admitted into the text if they are supported by the best authority, as more truly representing the original words especially in numerals. Variations of readings and corruptions of names have been arranged in the order of modification, so as to elucidate as far as possible the process of the changes, and when so placed, readings that are corrupt often prove to be highly instructive as regards both language and script⁶.

36. Though I am not an advocate of the use of Roman characters in lieu of Devanāgarī, yet, as this work is intended for the use of all interested in Indian archaeology whether Sanskrit scholars or not, practical usefulness should be the chief consideration in this presentation of the Purāṇic accounts of the dynasties of the Kali age. Hence the Roman character has been used throughout, because it

¹ E.g., in p. 60, note ⁶⁸ *dfIVā* have *śatāt śatam* actually.

² As where conjunct nasals are written for convenience as anusvāra, or where consonants conjoined with *r* are optionally doubled.

³ Thus the Calc. edition of the Vāyu has *Snecca* sometimes instead of *Mleccha* by an obvious printer's error: see p. 47, note ⁷⁶.

⁴ As the insertion or omission of final anusvāra or visarga through mere carelessness.

⁵ To have noticed such minutiae would have swollen the notes beyond all reason and usefulness.

⁶ E.g. p. 39, note ⁴⁵; p. 40, note ⁶⁹; p. 47, note ⁷²; p. 49, note ¹⁴.

offers several advantages over Devanāgarī, namely, (1) words can be separated which would be all run together when written properly in Devanāgarī; (2) compound words and words that have fused together by sandhi can be divided by hyphens and so displayed distinctly; and (3) by so treating words capitals can be introduced for names, and names can be exhibited unmistakably, even when initial vowels have been modified by sandhi. The system of transliteration is that adopted by the Royal Asiatic Society and most other Oriental Societies. Where vowels are blended by sandhi, the resultant vowel has been marked with a circumflex, except *ai* and *au* where a circumflex is inconvenient and hardly necessary. Changes in sandhi, which are required by the variant readings, are treated as necessarily consequential and are not mentioned. It has been necessary to introduce the double hyphen (used in transliterating inscriptions and MSS) in order to distinguish separate words that have become fused by sandhi¹, and I trust this sign may be pardoned here, especially as this Purāṇic account is not literature but only patch-work Sanskritization.

Interpretation of the Account.

37. In interpreting the account the fact must be borne in mind that it was written in Prakrit originally, and this will throw light on many points, especially the variations in names and the meaning of numbers. It will explain how corruptions in names have sometimes occurred², it will help to elucidate doubtful passages³, and will be the best guide in solving difficulties in readings which appear corrupt⁴. The best course in such cases is to convert the different readings into literary Prakrit, write the Prakrit forms in the various old scripts, compare them, and see whether one can divine what was probably the original Prakrit statement. These remarks apply especially to the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa versions.

38. There is often great variation in names. In some cases the correct form can be selected by reference to other books or to inscriptions, but where there is no such agreement I have not ventured to emend the Purāṇic forms from other sources, because it is my duty simply to edit the text and not to attempt to make it square with our present scanty knowledge of ancient Indian history—which is a separate matter. In such cases I have confined myself to estimating what form of the name is best attested by the MSS, and often the only feasible course is to adopt the most central form from which the other forms may be considered

¹ Chiefly where names have fused with other words by single or double sandhi, as *bhaviṣyōdayanas* (p. 7, l. 23; p. 82) and *bhavitāśoka* (p. 27, l. 2; p. 28, l. 4 in *eVā*); these are printed as *bhaviṣy-ōdayanas* and *bhavit-āśoka* in order to bring out the name clearly. It could hardly be dispensed with in such cases of double sandhi as *Yavandṣtau*

and *onāvyānyāh* (see p. 82); and as no line could well be drawn regarding its use, the simplest course was to adopt it throughout, except in the Appendixes and Introduction.

² *E.g.* p. 40, note⁶⁰; p. 41, note⁷⁴.

³ *E.g.* p. 52, notes^{37, 38, 42}.

⁴ P. 59, line 11 is an excellent crux for such solution.

INTERPRETATION OF THE ACCOUNT

xxiii

to diverge¹; but this is a measure more of convenience than of accuracy, because it happens sometimes that the correct form is what would appear to be an aberrant form²; and in such cases what is, or would seem to be, the correct form is suggested sometimes in the notes³.

39. The numbers present much difficulty. Those that occur oftenest are *vimśati* and *triṁśati*, and their abbreviated forms *vimśat* and *triṁśat*, *vimśa* and *triṁśa*⁴; and the difficulty arises because *tr* and *v*, if written carelessly or if partially frayed, are hardly distinguishable in the later script⁵, and *t* and *v* in the Prakrit forms of these words might have been confused from the first in Kharoṣṭhī. Hence in many cases either may be read as other data may indicate, irrespective of the weight of the MSS.

40. Various groups of misreadings will appear on an examination of the notes, and the most important may be mentioned here. First, *abda*, if the loop of the *b* be carelessly written so as to touch the top bar (as I have found it sometimes), may easily be misread as *aṣṭa*, and there can be no doubt that *abda* and *aṣṭa* have often been confused. Thus, where most MSS read *aṣṭapañcāśatām cābdan*⁶, one has *cābdā*, two *cāṣṭān*, and one *cāṣṭā*; and here *aṣṭa* is plainly a corruption of *abda* because it is impossible after *aṣṭapañcāśatām*. Again, one set of readings is *so smā daśa*, *so 'smāḍ daśa* and *tasmāḍ daśa*, and another set is *aṣṭām daśa*, *aṣṭādaśa* and *so 'ṣṭādaśa*⁷: the latter suggest the reading *abdān daśa*, which (with the frequent use of anusvāra for nasals) would be often written *abdām daśa* and might be misread as *aṣṭāmdaśa* and so pass to *aṣṭādaśa*: thus *abdān daśa* would reconcile all the readings as regards the number and would seem to have been the original reading. The same confusion occurs in other places⁸. This liability of *abda* and *aṣṭa* to be confused may harmonize other passages where the numbers 10 and 18 are in conflict. Moreover, *abda*, if the initial *a* is elided by Sanskrit or Prakrit sandhi, becomes *bda*; and *bda* may be mistaken for *dva* (= *dvan*)⁹; hence *dvā* and *dvan* become a third alternative, and this possibility may harmonize other passages¹⁰. Secondly, *samā* and *sapta* have been confused sometimes, for it is not always easy to distinguish *m* and *pt* where written carelessly in the more modern scripts, as I have found. Thus two readings occur *saptāśītiṁ* and *saṁāśītiṁ*¹¹, and either might be derived from the other¹².

¹ See p. 39, note ⁴⁰ for an instance.

² E.g. Vindusāra, whose name is given correctly only by the Viṣṇu (p. 28, notes ²³, ²⁴).

³ As in p. 6, note ²⁹; p. 42, note ⁹².

⁴ In *nMt* *ṣaḍvimśati* looks like *ṣaḍgimśati* generally, and *ṣaṭtriṁśati* like *ṣaḍimśati*.

⁵ For a clear instance see p. 57, note ⁴.

⁶ P. 15, l. 17, and notes.

⁷ P. 39, l. 5, and notes.

⁸ See p. 19, note ⁴⁶; p. 30, note ⁴⁶; p. 43, note ³⁵; p. 47, note ⁷⁷; p. 60, notes ⁷⁰, ⁸⁰;

p. 61, note ¹; p. 62, note ³⁵. For the reverse cf. perhaps p. 29, note ³¹.

⁹ I have not seldom found *bd*, *db*, and *dbh* inverted in the MSS, and *b* is generally written as *v*. See p. 22, note ⁴².

¹⁰ Cf. probably p. 40, l. 13.

¹¹ That is, *saṁāḥ aśītiṁ* by double, or Prakrit, sandhi: p. 47, note ⁶⁴.

¹² See also p. 29, note ⁴⁴; p. 31, note ¹³; p. 40, notes ⁵⁴, ⁵⁵.

41. Misreadings could easily affect other numerals. Thus, *catvāriṃśa-t* occurs at times where it may be erroneous¹, and in such cases it might easily be a mistaken Sanskritization of Prakrit *cattāri sa* (or perhaps *ca*), for *cattāri* is both nomin. and accus., and is of all three genders². Again *daśa* and *śata* are sometimes confused³, and, since *daśa* appears in Prakrit as *daśa* and *dasa*, and *śatq* as *śada* and *sada*⁴, either word might easily be altered to the other, since metathesis occurs in the MSS⁵. Again the final *ti* of numerals, especially *saptati*, may be a misreading of *vi* which may in Prakrit represent 'pi'⁶ or *vai*⁷ (Pali *ve*), for *v* and *t* might easily be confused in Kharoṣṭhi, so that *saptati* should probably be *sapta vai* in some cases⁸. In short in dealing with all numerals, it must be remembered that they were Prakrit originally, and their Prakrit forms are of primary importance.

42. The combination of numerals is important. They are used in two ways, first, in correct Sanskrit compounds, such as *caturviṃśati*, 24; *aṣṭatrinśac-chatam*, 138; *saptatrinśac-chatam*, 137⁹; and secondly, strung together in separate words. The latter construction alone requires notice, because it often follows what seems to me to have been a Prakrit arrangement and, if so, should be interpreted according to Prakrit usage. Thus, in Prakrit 'hundred' preceded by 'three' means 'three hundred', but followed by 'three' means apparently 'hundred (and) three'. The Prakrit numerals were Sanskritized as they stood, and were then declined regularly, so that 'three' appears as *trīṇi*, and 'hundred' seems to appear similarly in the plural as *satāni*. If this view be right, *trīṇi satāni* mean 'three hundred', but *satāni trīṇi* 'hundred and three'. This conclusion may be tested by some cases, for it is very important if it is right.

43. The most important passage for this purpose is the statement that 18 Śakas would reign *satāni trīṇi aṣṭim ca* years¹⁰. This expression is ordinarily read as correct Sanskrit to mean 380, but there are cogent grounds to show that these words cannot have that meaning. These Śakas are, in Dr. Fleet's opinion, *Nahapāna* and his successors, whose kingdom began with (or about) the Śaka era, A.D. 78; and if these words mean 380, the conclusion could be and has been drawn that this Purāṇic notice was written after they had reigned 380 years, that is, about the year A.D. 458¹¹. Now this conclusion involves this consequence, that the account brings the notice of the Śakas down to A.D. (458) and yet wholly ignores the great Gupta

¹ See p. 14, l. 10; p. 21, ll. 3, 6; p. 22, l. 13; &c.

² Pischel's Prakrit Grammar, § 439.

³ See p. 30, note ⁴⁶; p. 33, note ⁵⁰.

⁴ Pischel, *op. cit.*, §§ 442, 448.

⁵ See p. 7, note ³³; p. 32, note ⁵²; p. 39, note ⁵⁵; p. 45, note ¹¹; p. 49, note ²⁰: also *nṛpaḥ* and *punaḥ* are confused through their Pkt forms *napa* and *pana*, see p. 11, note ⁵¹, and p. 45, note ¹.

⁶ Pischel, *op. cit.*, § 145.

⁷ *Sapta vi* actually occurs for *sapta vai*,

p. 53, note ⁴. Similarly in names a final *vi* has been treated as a particle and the name curtailed, cf. p. 40, note ⁶⁹, p. 42, note ⁶⁸ and p. 43, note ²⁴.

⁸ E.g. p. 28, l. 7.

⁹ P. 19, l. 10; p. 28, l. 9; p. 30, l. 15.

¹⁰ *Various Local Dynasties*, p. 46, l. 9. The number of Śaka kings is given also as 10, or 16 (see p. 45, l. 3), which seem more probable.

¹¹ JRAS, 1912, p. 1047.

INTERPRETATION OF THE ACCOUNT

xxv

empire which was paramount in North India after A.D. 340 and was still flourishing in 458¹. This is incredible, because the Gupta kings were orthodox Hindus, guided by brahman advisers, and skilled in Sanskrit²; and this Purāṇic account, which was brahmanical, would unquestionably, if not closed till 458, have extolled their fame. The argument *ex silentio* is incontestable here. The fact then that the account knows nothing of events most congenial to brahmanism later than 330, shows that the rendering '380' leads to impossible results: indeed no date later than about A.D. 330 is possible. These words *śatāni trīṇi aśvini ca* occur in the Matsya as well as in the Vāyu and Brahmanḍa, and the Matsya account is that which was compiled in the Bhaviṣya about or soon after the middle of the 3rd century A.D. If we read these words as '380' with reference to that time, they take us back to about 130 or 120 B.C. as the beginning of these Śakas—a result that no one will accept. From both these alternative interpretations therefore it appears that the rendering of these words as '380' stultifies them.

44. We may now try reading these words as 'hundred, three, and eighty', 183. Applying them to Nahapāna and his successors and reckoning from A.D. 78 as before, we obtain the year A.D. 260-1 as the date of this notice of the Śakas, and this agrees entirely with the conclusion, reached above on other grounds (§ 21) that the account was first compiled about or soon after the middle of the 3rd century. This rendering '183' therefore brings all the particulars into an agreement which is strong evidence that it is the true meaning; and it further gives something like a precise date for the first compilation of the account in the Bhaviṣya as preserved in the Matsya, namely, A.D. 260-1. This statement, that the Śakas had reigned 183 years in A.D. 260, does not imply that they had come to an end then, but simply that the account being compiled then could say nothing about the future. So far as the account is concerned, they might have reigned, and in fact did reign, long afterwards, for there are coin-dates for them down to the year '311'. Such coin dates refer to a time after the account was compiled, and are in no conflict with the rendering '183'. This date A.D. 260-1 is a lower limit, for, if the Śakas formed a kingdom before their era was established, the reckoning would start from before A.D. 78, and the 183 years would have expired some little time before A.D. 260.

45. This conclusion is corroborated by the notice of the Hūnas or Maunas along with the Śakas. They are said to have reigned eleven for *śatāni trīṇi* years³. It is not known when their rule began, so that exact calculations cannot be made for them; but, if these words be read as '300', difficulties occur precisely similar to those discussed with regard to the Śakas and show that that meaning cannot be right. Read as meaning '103' however the statement may be true; Hūnas or Maunas may have formed some small kingdom for 103 years on the frontiers of

¹ V. Smith, *Early History of India*, 2nd ed., pp. 289-90.

² *Id.*, pp. 282, 287.

³ P. 47, l. 14. Their number is also given less probably as 18 or 19 (cf. p. 46, l. 5).

India in A.D. 260. The corresponding line relating to the Tuṣāras is certainly corrupt, and their period should probably be 105 or 107 years¹, which would be possible in A.D. 260.

46. All the statements regarding the 'Various Local Dynasties' in pp. 45-47 must be read with reference to the date of the first compilation which is preserved in the Matsya. When the account was revised and brought up to date in the Bhaviṣya at the Gupta era in the version found now in the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa, the periods assigned to the Śaka and other mleccha dynasties should have been revised for the further period of 60 or 70 years, but that was not done, for the periods are the same in the two versions. The brahmans, who revised the account at that time, merely revised the language and not the statements. That was natural, for revision of the statements required fresh and precise calculations, for which they may have had few data and certainly had little inclination, as the dynasties were mleccha or śūdra. All they did was to extend the account by adding the fresh matter contained in p. 48, l. 16 to p. 55, l. 17; yet in that they do appear to have included further particulars about the Śakas on p. 49, for there can be little doubt that Nahapāna's successors are alluded to in 4², though the context is vague.

47. This examination of the circumstances thus leads to the conclusion that the numerals discussed here cannot be read as correct Sanskrit, and that read in the way now suggested they accord with the circumstances and also apparently with Prakrit usage. Hence I would submit that they must be interpreted in that way. This construction simplifies numerical statements remarkably and reduces to reasonable and probable totals figures that seem at first wild and extravagant. At the same time one must hesitate to assert that numerical statements must always be so read, for it certainly seems that the period assigned to the Andhras by the Matsya is 460 rather than 164 years³.

Conclusion.

48. The foregoing results and inferences may be summarized thus. The Bhaviṣya was the first Purāṇa to give an account of the dynasties of the Kali age, and the Matsya, Vāyu. and Brahmāṇḍa got their accounts from it (§§ 7, 8), though

¹ P. 47, l. 11 with p. 45, l. 4. *Sahasrāṇi* is sometimes a corruption of *sa* (or *tu*) *varṣāni*, see p. 25, note ¹⁸; p. 46, note ^{3a}.

² This would be natural, if they fostered brahmanism and Sanskrit learning during the 3rd century (V. Smith, *History*, p. 287); though they are treated so curtly in the earlier part, before they favoured Hinduism.

³ It says there were 19 Andhra kings, and I may offer a tentative suggestion. The Andhra who overthrew the Kāṇvāyanas

was not Simuka as these Purāṇic accounts say, but probably one of the kings, nos. 12-14 (V. Smith, *History*, p. 194). Possibly then the Matsya account may refer only to him and his successors, and they may have been 19: but the period if read as 164 years would be too short for them. Otherwise its reading *ekonaviṃśatir* should probably be *ekonatriṃśatir*, which is quite possible, see § 39.

CONCLUSION

xxvii

they no doubt, and many of the Purāṇas certainly, existed before the Bhaviṣya (§ 28, note). Metrical accounts of the dynasties, that reigned in North India after the great battle between the Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas, grew up gradually, composed in ślokas in a literary Prakrit and recited by bards and minstrels (§§ 15-17); and, after writing was introduced into India about seven centuries B.C., there could have been no lack of materials from which those accounts could have been composed and even written down (§ 17). Such accounts were composed in or near Magadha more particularly, which was one of the chief centres of political life and thought during those times (§ 13) and was famous for its bards and minstrels (§ 17); and the Prakrit in which they were expressed was no doubt a literary Māgadhi or Pali (§ 17).

49. The Bhaviṣya professed to treat of future events, subsequent to that battle which practically ushered in the Kali age (§ 14), and should therefore supply an account of the dynasties of that age, because royal vaiśās were one of the prescribed topics of the Purāṇas (§ 28); and, as the Purāṇas professed to have been composed by Vyāsa, it took the same standpoint. Hence it appropriated the Prakrit metrical accounts, converted the Prakrit ślokas into Sanskrit ślokas, and altered them to the form of a prophecy uttered by Vyāsa (§§ 28, 29, Appx I); and this re-shaping was carried through generally yet not completely (§ 12). Some compilation seems to have been made, of the Andhras at least, in the reign of the Andhra king Yajñaśrī about the end of the second century A.D. (§ 21, note)¹; but the first definite compilation is that which brought the 'history' down from the time of the battle to a little later than the end of the Andhras², together with the final portion³, and was incorporated in the Bhaviṣya about or soon after the middle of the third century (§§ 19, 21, 24); and there are reasons for fixing its date as not later than A.D. 260-1 (§ 44). That account was apparently written in Kharoṣṭhī and composed in Northern India (§ 27). The Matsya borrowed it from the Bhaviṣya, probably during the last quarter of the third century (§ 23), and so has preserved what the Bhaviṣya contained then.

50. The Bhaviṣya account was revised about the years 315-320 and brought up to date by the insertion of the later dynastic matter⁴ and much addition to the 'Evils of the Kali Age'⁵: it was still in Kharoṣṭhī, and was certainly written down then (§§ 23, 27). That version was borrowed by the Vāyu then, but exists now only in one MS, eVāyu (§ 23). The language of the account in the Bhaviṣya was revised again about the years 325-380, and that version was adopted by the Vāyu, and soon afterwards by the Brahmāṇḍa⁶, and now constitutes their general versions (§ 23). They have thus preserved what the Bhaviṣya contained at that time.

¹ It is possible that the use of the present tense for the three ancient Paurava, Aikṣvāku and Bārhadratha kings (§ 11) may have something genuine in it.

² P. 1 to l. 15 on p. 48.

³ Pp. 55-63: see § 25.

⁴ P. 48, l. 16 to p. 55.

⁵ Pp. 55, 56.

⁶ But the Brahmāṇḍa may have copied from the Vāyu (§ 23, note).

INTRODUCTION

51. The Viṣṇu next utilized the account, perhaps before the end of the fourth century, and condensed it all in Sanskrit prose except the concluding portion (§ 27). The Bhāgavata also drew its materials from the same sources, from the Brahmandā and more particularly the Viṣṇu; it retained some of the old ślokas, but in the main condensed the matter into new Sanskrit ślokas; and it probably belongs to the 8th or even 9th century (§ 27). The Garuḍa utilized the same materials for the three great early dynasties only, and has merely a bald list of the kings in new Sanskrit ślokas; but its date is uncertain (Appx I, II).

52. Since those times a quiet process of small emendations in details has been at work in these Purāṇas; but the Bhaviṣya, the source of them all, has been unscrupulously tampered with in order to keep its prophecies up to date, and the text now presented in the Venkateśvara edition shows all the ancient matter utterly corrupted, but the prophecies brought boldly down to the nineteenth century.

53. The sixty-three MSS of these Purāṇas that have been collated have yielded a great quantity of different readings, and no pains have been spared to state and arrange them correctly, so that I trust the notes will be found free from errors. The Index comprises all names and forms of names mentioned in the text, notes, translation, appendixes, and introduction, except such peculiar forms as are obviously erroneous or occur in single MSS of no particular trustworthiness.

54. In conclusion I have to tender my thanks to Dr. J. F. Fleet. He had long thought that a critical edition of the Purāṇa texts of these dynasties was greatly needed, and it was at his desire that I undertook this work, which has proved full of interest. He has done me the kindness to read most of this Introduction, and to offer me some criticisms and suggestions, which have been of great help and have also opened up some new questions that I have now endeavoured to elucidate; and he has supplied the valuable references to various inscriptions which mention certain kings named in these dynastic lists.

F. E. PARGITER.

OXFORD, May 15, 1913.

LIST OF AUTHORITIES

Editions and Manuscripts collated.

BHĀGAVATA PURĀṆA.

- B*Bh. The edition published in part by Burnouf and continued afterwards. Skandha ix is in Skt, but sk xii only in translation. It differs very little from *G*Bh.
- G*Bh. The edition published by the Ganpat Krishnaji Press, Bombay, 1889. Has a commentary, and some variant readings rarely.

MSS in the Bodleian Library.

- a*Bh. Wilson 22; Auf. Cat. no. 86. Dated 1711. In Bengali characters; fairly well written; contains sk x-xii only.
- b*Bh. Wilson 121-3; Auf. Cat. nos. 79-81. Dated 1813-6. Sk xii contains only the last portion, the Evils of the Kali Age, &c.
- c*Bh. Mill 133-6; Auf. Cat. nos. 82-5. Dated 1823. Writing moderately good; many clerical errors.
- d*Bh. Fraser 2; Auf. Cat. nos. 809-10. Does not contain sk ix; sk xii is dated 1407. Genly accurate. A very valuable MS; it contains alterations by another and apply later hand, which are not always sound.
- e*Bh. Walker 215-6; Auf. Cat. nos. 811-2. Dated 1794. Is close to *G*Bh and fairly correct; writing poor.
- f*Bh. Skt MS c. 54; W and K. Cat. no. 1180. Dated 1642. A very valuable MS in Śaradā script. Writing good and almost free from mistakes.

MSS in the India Office Library.

- g*Bh. No. 3206, E 3461. Date about 1650. Fairly good.
- h*Bh. Nos. 2759-60, E 3463-4. Dated 1762-3. Contains sk v-xii; writing poor but fairly correct, except for many small clerical errors.
- j*Bh. No. 976, E 3466. Modern. Contains sk viii-xii; well written and fairly correct.
- k*Bh. Nos. 654 and 656, E 3470 and 3472. Modern. Carelessly written.
- l*Bh. Nos. 1838-9, E 3474-5. Modern. Well written, with few clerical errors; is close to *G*Bh.
- m*Bh. Nos. 2502 and 2506, E 3489 and 3493. Dated 1779-81. Fairly good.

xxx

LIST OF AUTHORITIES

- nBh. Nos. 2756-7, E 3495-6. Dated 1780-1. Fairly well written, with few clerical errors.
- pBh. Nos. 2437 and 2439, E 3503 and 3505. Date, 18th cent. Fairly good.
- qBh. Jones MS; W 3a, T 32. Date, beginning of 17th cent. Fairly good.
- rBh. Jones MS; W 3b, T 33. Date, end of 18th cent. In Bengali characters; fairly good.
- sBh. Jones MS; W 3c, T 34. Date, 18th cent. Written on palm leaves; fairly good: does not contain sk ix.
- tBh. Tagore MS; no. 106; Auf. list no. 14. Date, about 1780. In Bengali characters on palm leaves.

There are two other MSS in the Bodleian—one, Wilson 117; Auf. Cat. no. 87, which contains sk x and not xii as stated in the Cat., and so has nothing about these dynasties: the other, Mill 145; Auf. Cat. no. 88, written on an extremely long narrow roll. There are also two similar MSS in the British Museum, Add. 16624 and 26419. These three are mere bijou MSS, written in minute characters and decorated with coloured pictures and designs.

BHAVIṢYA PURĀṆA.

Edition published by the Śrī-Venkaṭeśvara Press, Bombay. The Pratisarga-parvan deals with the dynasties of the Kali age, but the account is not genuine, see Introdn. §§ 6, 9, 28, and ZDMG, lvii, 276.

I have examined the following MSS, but none of them contain anything about these dynasties:—

- in the India Office Library*, two, no. 1314, E 3447, and no. 1429, E 3448;
- in the Bodleian Library*, three, Auf. Cat. nos. 75 (Wilson 103), 76 (Wilson 126), and 77 (Wilson 124);
- in the Royal Asiatic Society*, MS Tod 2;
- in the Nepal State Library*, one MS sent to Oxford with other selected MSS.

I have also made inquiries about MSS elsewhere, but have not found any in which this dynastic matter can be deemed genuine. The Sanskrit College, Calcutta, has a MS, q no. 106, from which two extracts were sent me; it describes the founding of Calcutta. Queen's College, Benares, has a MS but it does not contain this dynastic matter, as Prof. Venis informs me. He sent me an extract from a MS belonging to the College Librarian, Pandit Vindhyeśvariprasād Dvivedī, but it deals with later events and especially with the Mohammedans.

BRAHMĀṆḌA PURĀṆA.

- Bd. The edition published by the Śrī-Venkaṭeśvara Press, Bombay. It professes to be based on several MSS, yet gives variant readings only rarely, and leaves on my mind the impression that it has been silently emended at times; cf. p. 25, note ²⁴; p. 26, note ⁴²; p. 34, note ⁵; p. 51, note ¹⁰.

LIST OF AUTHORITIES

xxxi

I have also examined the following MSS, but they contain nothing about these dynasties:—

in the India Office Library, two, Burnell MS no. 458, and Tagore MS no. 10 (Auf. list, no. 11);

in the Bodleian Library, three, Auf. Cat. nos. 72 (Mill 51), 73 (Wilson 105), and 74 (Walker 130).

GARUDA PURĀṆA.

CGr. The edition published by Jivānanda Vidyāsāgar, Calcutta, 1890. It contains no notes of variant readings.

MSS in the India Office Library.

aGr. No. 1199 c, E 3353. Dated 1727? Far from correct. Account begins, fol. 114^a, l. 1.

bGr. No. 2560, E 3355. Modern. Very incorrect. Account begins, fol. 103^a.

cGr. No. 1199 a, E 3354. Dated 1800. Badly written. Account begins, fol. 127^a, l. 2.

The Bodleian Library has one, Skt MS c. 50; but it contains nothing about these dynasties.

MATSYA PURĀṆA.

AMt. The Ānandāśrama (Poona) edition, 1907. It is based on 6 copies, the Veṅkaṭeśvara (Bombay) edition (marked क and cited here as VMt), the Gondhalekar (Poona) edition (marked ख and cited here as GMt), and 4 MSS marked ग, घ, ङ and च, and cited here as a^1 , a^2 , a^3 , and a^4 respectively.

CMt. The Calcutta edition by Jivānanda Vidyāsāgar, 1876.

GMt. The Gondhalekar edition; see AMt.

VMt. The Veṅkaṭeśvara edition; see AMt.

aMt. See AMt.

MSS in the Bodleian Library.

bMt. Wilson 21; Auf. Cat. no. 95. Dated 1729. Well written, fairly free from clerical mistakes, but errs widely in names and has corrupt readings, especially near the end. Has marginal notes of different readings by one or two other hands; these form no part of the text and are not noticed here. Where it varies from the general Mt text, it often agrees with the Vā and Bḍ.

cMt. Fraser 1; Auf. Cat. nos. 813-4. Date, 17th cent. apptly. Fairly well written and genly correct. Where it varies from AMt it agrees often with AVā. Paurava kings, vol. i, fol. 113^a, verse 55; the rest, vol. ii, fol. 575^b, l. 1.

MSS in the India Office Library.

dMt. No. 1918, E 3548. Dated 1525. Good, but with not a few inaccuracies. Where it differs from AMt, it agrees often with AVā. Paurava kings, fol. 63^a, l. 8; other dynasties, fol. 307^a, l. 2.

LIST OF AUTHORITIES

- eMt.* No. 2032, E 3549. Dated 1767. Writing poor and full of clerical mistakes: agrees genly with *cMt* and sometimes corruptly. Paurava kings, fol. 67^b, l. 13; other dynasties, fol. 321^b, l. 8.
- fMt.* No. 1080, E 3550. Dated 1795. Fairly well written; many small clerical mistakes (as *s* for *ś* often) and a very few corrections. Paurava kings, fol. 62^a, l. 13; other dynasties, fol. 327^b, last line.
- gMt.* Nos. 406-7, E 3551-2. Modern. Much like *fMt.* Paurava kings, vol. i, fol. 79^a; other dynasties, vol. ii, fol. 437^b.
- hMt.* No. 2831, E 3553. Modern. Contains only the first part of the *Mt.* Fairly well written; some special readings. Only Paurava kings, fol. 166^b, l. 9.
- jMt.* No. 3347, Jackson Collection. Modern. Fairly well written; aptly copied carefully from a damaged MS and so has small blanks: many small errors. Valuable as it has several special readings, which are aptly ancient. Paurava kings, fol. 62^b, l. 6; other dynasties, fol. 330^a, l. 9.

MSS in the Dekhan College, Poona (collated for me by a paṇḍit through the kindness of the Professor of Sanskrit at the College).

- AMt.* Skt MS no. 28 of 1871-2. Much like *ceMt.*
- IMt.* Skt MS no. 164 of 1887-91.
- mMt.* Skt MS no. 340 of Viśrama (first collection).

MSS in the British Museum.

- nMt.* Add. 14348. Date, 18th cent. Fairly well written; fairly accurate, though with some carelessness: resembles *cMt.* Paurava kings, fol. 98^b; other dynasties, fol. 508^a.
- pMt.* Add. 26414. Date, 18th cent. Fairly well written and genly correct; closely like *AMt.* Contains only the Preface and Pauravas; begins fol. 42^b.

VĀYU PURĀṆA.

- AVā.* The Ānandāśrama (Poona) edition, 1905. It is based on five copies, the Calcutta edition (marked क; see *CVā* below), and 4 MSS marked ख, ग, घ, and ङ and cited here as *a*¹, *a*², *a*³, and *a*⁴ respectively.
- CVā.* The Bibliotheca Indica edition, Calcutta. It is based on 6 MSS, but only rarely notes variant readings.
- aVā.* See *AVā.*

MSS in the Bodleian Library.

- bVā.* Wilson 120; Auf. Cat. no. 104. Date, early 19th cent. Fairly well written, but with a good many mistakes and not a few repetitions. Account begins, fol. 237^a, l. 4.
- cVā.* Wilson 355; Auf. Cat. no. 103. Date 15th cent. Unfortunately contains nothing about these dynasties.

MSS in the India Office Library.

- dVā.* Jones MS; W 6a, T 37. Date, end of 18th cent. Valuable, because aptly copied from one MS and corrected by another: yet not accurate. Account begins, vol. ii, fol. 386^a, l. 9.

LIST OF AUTHORITIES

xxxiii

- eVā.* Jones MS; W 6b, T 38. Not dated. Writing fairly good, but diction rather illiterate. Very valuable, because it has readings different from the printed editions, and some verses not contained therein; and where it differs therefrom, it often agrees with the Mt (see Introdn. § 22). Unfortunately it has a lacuna at the beginning. Account begins, fol. 198^a, l. 11.
- fVā.* No. 1869, E 3587. Date, about 1600. Fairly well written, but many small errors. It has a large lacuna at the beginning, and commences in fol. 358^b, l. 5 with l. 23 of the Aikṣvākus.
- gVā.* No. 2103, E 3589. Dated 1483. Fairly well written. Account begins, fol. 311^b, l. 10.
- hVā.* No. 1310, E 3590. Modern. Full of mistakes, especially at the beginning; agrees closely with *hVā* even in the errors.
- jVā.* No. 264, E 3591. Date, about 1800. Badly written, full of mistakes and gaps; has a lacuna at the beginning and commences only with l. 23 of the Aikṣvākus in fol. 347^a, l. 7.

MSS in the Dekhan College, Poona (collated for me by a paṇḍit through the kindness of the Professor of Sanskrit at the College).

- kVā.* Skt MS no. 8 of 1874-5. Has lost all the account after l. 17 on p. 48.
- lVā.* Skt MS no. 110 of 1881-2.

MS in the Royal Asiatic Society.

- mVā.* Tod 14. Writing poor, with many small mistakes; much like *fVā*.

VIṢṆU PURĀṆA.

- CVṣ.* The edition by Jivānanda Vidyāsāgar, Calcutta, 1882. Has a commentary, but no notes of variant readings.

MSS in the Bodleian Library.

- aVṣ.* Wilson 26; Auf. Cat. no. 112. Date, 18th cent. Beautifully written in Bengali characters. Account begins, fol. 102^a.
- bVṣ.* Wilson 108; Auf. Cat. no. 109. Dated 1703. Fairly well written and fairly correct. Much like *aVṣ*.
- cVṣ.* Wilson 107; Auf. Cat. no. 110. Dated 1740. Writing good but careless: close to *CVṣ*.
- dVṣ.* Wilson 130; Auf. Cat. no. 111. Date, late 18th cent. Well written and fairly correct close to *CVṣ*.

MSS in the India Office Library.

- eVṣ.* No. 420, E 3606. Dated 1770. Writing poor, with not a few mistakes.
- fVṣ.* No. 1380, E 3607. Modern. Fairly good.
- gVṣ.* No. 1695, E 3608. Modern. Well written and accurate.
- hVṣ.* Bunnell MS no. 374. Fairly well written, with some variant readings.

e

LIST OF AUTHORITIES

MSS in the Indian Institute, Oxford.

- jVṣ. Malan MS; cat. no. 122. Date, 18th cent. Writing poor, with many small blunders and omissions, some of which have been corrected by a later hand in Bengali writing.
- kVṣ. Cat. no. 121. Dated 1736 (?). Fairly well written and genly correct, but has strange mistakes at times, probably through defects of the MS copied: contains several interesting readings.

MS in the Royal Asiatic Society.

- IVṣ. Whish MS no. 33. From South India; written on palm leaves in modern Grantha. Well and carefully written, but often shortens the connecting phrases in the first half, and omits the Bārhadrathas: agrees often with kVṣ. A valuable MS, which checks the readings of North Indian MSS. Account begins, fol. 166^a, l. 7.

ABBREVIATIONS.

- * (prefixed) denotes a hypothetical word.
 + (prefixed) denotes a corrupt reading.
 apptly = apparently.
 crp = corrupt, corruptly.
 genly = generally.

- MBh = Mahābhārata.
 Pkt = Prakrit.
 prob = probable, probably.
 Skt = Sanskrit.
 syll = syllable.

CORRIGENDA

- p. xvii, line 8, *for his read Vyāsa's*
- p. 48, line 14, *for Kielhorn's Inscriptions of Northern India (Epig. Ind. v, Appendix) read Lüders' List of the Brāhmī Inscriptions (Epig. Ind. x, Appendix),*
- p. 50, line 17, *for pp. read Lüders' List of the Brāhmī Inscriptions, nos.*

Pargiter: Dynasties

Account of the Kali Age.

THE PURĀṆA TEXT

OF THE

DYNASTIES OF THE KALI AGE

PREFACE

The Matsya and Vāyu Purāṇas introduce a preface into the middle of the account of the Paurava dynasty. Both bring the Paurava (or Aila) genealogy from the Pāṇḍavas to Abhimanyu, Parikṣit, and Janamejaya¹, and then describe Janamejaya's dispute with Vaiśampāyana and the brahmins about his Vājasaneyaka doctrine². They then continue the genealogy to Adhisimākṛṣṇa, in whose reign was performed the twelve-year sacrifice during which these Purāṇas profess to have been recited³. At this point the rishis ask the Sūta for a full account of the Kali age⁴, and he proposes to give it in verses which are here treated as the Preface⁵. Then starting from Adhisimākṛṣṇa as the existing king, he carries on the dynasty to its close⁶. In order to simplify the arrangement, the prefatory portion is placed here first, and the separated parts of the Paurava genealogy are joined together in a continuous account and given next as the Paurava line. The story of Janamejaya's dispute⁷, the rishis' questions, and the Sūta's resumption of his account are omitted as superfluous⁸. The Preface therefore consists of—

Text—AMt 50, 72-76; AVā 99, 264-269.

All copies contain this preface, except that AMt omits lines 6-10; AMt misplaces l. 11 after l. 5; eVā has lost the first 5½ lines and it alone contains ll. 12-14; gVā omits l. 11; and fjmVā have nothing. All agree in the text except where noted, and where the Matsya and Vāyu are different, both versions are given, the Matsya on the left and the Vāyu on the right. The Brahmanḍa has lost the preface in a large lacuna. The Viṣṇu, Bhāgavata, and Garuḍa have no preface.

¹ AMt 50, 57; AVā 99, 249b-250a.

² AMt 50, 58-64; AVā 99, 250b-255.

³ AMt 50, 65-67; AVā 99, 256-259.

⁴ AMt 50, 68-71; AVā 99, 260-263.

⁵ AMt 50, 72-76; AVā 99, 264-269.

⁶ AMt 50, 77-89; AVā 99, 270-280a.

⁷ This is given in Appendix III as it shows some brahmanical tampering with the Vāyu.

⁸ See Introdn. § 14.

Sūta uvāca—

Yathā me¹ kīrtitam pūrvam² Vyāsenākliṣṭa³-karmanā
bhāvyam⁴ Kali-yugam⁵ c'aiva tathā manvantarāṇi ca⁶
anāgatāni⁷ sarvāṇi bruvato me nibodhata
✓ata ūrdhvam⁸ pravakṣyāmi bhaviṣyā ye⁹ nrpās tathā¹⁰
Aid-Ēkṣvākv-anvaye¹¹ c'aiva | Ailāms¹² c'aiva tath-Ēkṣvākūn¹³
Paurave c'ānvaye¹⁴ tathā | Saudyumnāms¹⁵ c'aiva pārthivān
yeṣu¹⁶ samsthāpyate¹⁷ kṣatram¹⁸ Aid-Ēkṣvāku¹⁹-kulam²⁰ śubham²¹
tān sarvān kīrtayiṣyāmi²² Bhaviṣye²³ kathitān²⁴ nrpān²⁵ 7
tebhyo 'pare 'pi ye²⁶ c'ānye²⁷ utpatsyante nrpāḥ punaḥ²⁸
kṣatrāḥ²⁹ pārasavāḥ³⁰ sūdrās tath-ānye ye³¹ vahiś-carāḥ³²
Andhrāḥ³³ Śakāḥ Pulindās ca Cūlikā³⁴ Yavanās tathā³⁵ 10

¹ Yath-aiva in jMt.

² So Mt. Vā sarvam.

³ So Mt. Vā °adbhuta.

⁴ Bhāvam in eMt; kMt bhavet.

⁵ Yuge in cejnMt.

⁶ So Mt. Vā tu.

⁷ Atr-āgatāni in lMt.

⁸ Param in jMt.

⁹ So Mt genly: bdMt bhaviṣy-ārthe; cejnMt bhāvino ye. Vā bhaviṣyanti. For this half line lMt reads bhaviṣyān kathitān (nrpān omitted) as in l. 7.

¹⁰ Smṛtāḥ in fgyMt. Vā tu ye.

¹¹ So a²a¹befnMt: CGVgpMt °k-ānvaye: cMt Ail-Ēk°; jMt + Ain-Ēk°; hMt + Aindk°; dMt + Ed-Ēk°; nMt crp: a²kMt Aid-Ēkṣvāku-nrpe: a¹Mt Ikṣvākor anvaye: lMt + Ēksakasya. Aida = Aila.

¹² Elāms in ghkVā.

¹³ In gVā tath-Aik°.

¹⁴ But nMt v-ānvaye; eMt c-ānya[ta]ye. This is pleonastic because the Pauravas were Ailas, see JRAS, 1910, pp. 16, 20.

¹⁵ This reading is better. The Saudyumnas were distinct from the Ailas and Aikṣvākus, being the descendants of Sudyumna, who was Manu's daughter Ilā when she gained man's form according to the fable; and they comprised the early kings of Gayā and the eastern region, Utkala and perhaps a country named Haritāśva or Vinatāśva in the west: see one version in Mt 12, 17-18; and another in Vā 85, 19, Bḍ iii, 60, 18-19, and Hariv. 10, 632.

¹⁶ In hMt yehi (Pkt for yebhiḥ?).

¹⁷ So Vā, ceMt: Mt genly samsthāsyate.

¹⁸ So a²-Vā; Ca'dghklVā kṣetram, a frequent mistake for kṣatram. Mt genly tac ca; cejyhnMt tatra.

¹⁹ So Mt genly; jMt Ain-Ēk°: hMt Ail-Ēkṣvākam, eVā °kun: dMt Ed-Ēk°. Vā genly Aikṣvākavam: lMt + Ēksakasya.

²⁰ So Mt. Vā idam.

²¹ Śrutān in lMt; smṛtam in dMt.

²² Kathayiṣyāmi in jMt.

²³ But dMt bhaviṣyān; enMt °syā; jMt °syat: see Introdn. § 7.

²⁴ So Mt. Vā paṭhitān; bVā paṭhito.

²⁵ Nrpa in bVā.

²⁶ So Mt: nMt omits ye. Vā pare ca ye.

²⁷ So Vā; eVā 'py anye. Mt genly tv anye hy; bcdghjnpMt omit hy.

²⁸ So Mt; eVā nrpās tathā: Vā genly mahīkṣitah.

²⁹ So Mt, Vā genly: cejnMt, eVā kṣatra-; a¹kVā + kṣetrāḥ; eMt + kṣatriyāḥ.

³⁰ So Mt, Vā genly: fgyMt pārasavāḥ, so nMt with pārasavāḥ also; bMt + pārasarāḥ; eVā + pārasarāḥ; eMt + pāravā; nMt + yāḥ-ravāḥ; lMt + pāsavi.

³¹ So Mt genly; jMt ca for ye: hMt tathā ye 'nye. Vā tathā ye ca; eVā tathā c-aiva.

³² So Mt genly: Ca¹a¹bdmpMt mahīśvarāḥ. Vā dvijātayāḥ.

³³ So Vā genly, chjnpMt; fgyMt Andhrāḥ: dhVā, Mt often, Andhāḥ: kVā Adhryāḥ.

³⁴ AOMt Cūlikā; eVā Cūl°; bVā Vūl°; hVā Vūn° (or Vūl°); dVā Vrūl°: Vā genly Tūl°; hMt Dhūl°; jMt Mūl°; bmpMt Cal°: Mt Pulihās; fgyMt Valimkā; dMt Bāhikā:

PAURAVAS

3

Kaivart-Ābhīra-Śabarā³⁶ ye cānye³⁷ Mleccha-sambhavāḥ³⁸
 Pauravā Vītihoṭrā vai Vaidiśāḥ³⁹ pañca⁴⁰ Kosalāḥ
 Mekalāḥ Kośalāḥ Pauṇḍrā Gaunardāḥ Svasphrakāś ca ha⁴¹
 Sunidharmāḥ Śakā Nīpā yās cānyā Mleccha-jātayah⁴²
 varṣ-āgrataḥ⁴³ pravakṣyāmi⁴⁴ nāmataś cāiva tān nṛpān⁴⁵.

15

Pauravas.

Text—AMt 50, 57, 65^a, 66, 78–89; AVā 99, 249^b, 250^a, 256^a–258^a, 271–280^a; Bḍ nil.

Corresp. passages—CVs iv, 20, 12–21, 4; GBh ix, 22, 34–45^a; CGr i, 140, 40–141, 4.

The arrangement of this dynasty has been explained above (p. 1). In the first portion the Matsya and Vāyu differ, and their versions are both given, the former on the left and the latter on the right; otherwise they agree except where noted. The Brahmanḍa has lost the whole in a lacuna.

The Bhāgavata is somewhat full about the first seven kings, but combines the rest in a succinct list. The Viṣṇu agrees closely with it. The Garuḍa gives merely a list of names.

All copies of Mt give the whole except lines 5, 27; and besides eMt omits l. 28 (second half) to l. 30 (first half); fMt ll. 10 and 17 (second half) to 20 (first half); and gMt l. 10. The Vā MSS are complete, except that eVā has lost ll. 1–6, 11 (first half) and 16 (second half) to 18 (first half): all copies, except eVā, omit

gVā omits this half line. *Cūlikā* appears to be the best form, see JRAS, 1912, p. 711.

³⁶ So Mt. Vā *Yavanāḥ saha*.

³⁷ So Mt, Vā genly (Śabarā or Śav°); eVā *Kaivartt-Araibhīra-varāḥ*; nMt *Kaivart-Ābhīra-Śabaro*.

³⁸ So Mt, Vā genly: nMt *ye v-ānye*: eVā *yās c-ānyā*, correcting the faulty grammar.

³⁹ So Mt. Vā *jātayah*.

⁴⁰ This line only in eVā, which reads *Rītihoṭrā vai Vaidikāḥ*; this should obviously be *Vītihoṭrā vai Vaidiśāḥ*, and has been emended so. For the Vītihoṭras see *Pradyotas*, line 1, *infra*; for Vaidiśas see *Dynasties of Vidiśā*, §c., *infra*.

⁴¹ *Pañca* suggests that *Pañcālas* are meant, and that this name has been in some way curtailed. For them see *Early Contemporary Dynasties*, line 2, *infra*.

⁴² This line only in eVā. For Mekalas

see *Dynasties of the 3rd Century*, line 5, *infra*.

⁴³ This line is only in eVā.

⁴⁴ So Vā genly, *chjkn*Mt. Mt genly *paryāyataḥ*. Other copies intermediate, eMt *vaśāgrataḥ*; dVā *vaśāyataḥ*; bVā *varṣāyata*; hVā *varyāyata*. *Varṣ-āgrataḥ* occurs in this context, AVā 99, 261—

varṣ-āgrato 'pi prabrūhi nāmataś cāiva tān nṛpān.

Varṣ-āgra occurs in AVā 21, 16, 21; 22, 3; where it means the 'total number of years'; hence *varṣ-āgrataḥ* here, being applied to the kings, would mean 'according to the totals of their years'. *Paryāyataḥ* is also good.

⁴⁵ In kMt *praviṣyāmi*.

⁴⁶ So Mt genly, Vā: *cek/n*Mt read this half line, *bhaviṣyān* (n, °syāt) *kathitān* (l, *kāśikān*) *nṛpān*, which should no doubt be *Bhaviṣye kathitān nṛpān*; see l. 7.

ll. 10 and 20 (second half) to 25 (first half); *hVā* omits ll. 15 (second half) to 18 (first half); *IVā* ll. 17 (second half) to l. 20; and *jjmVā* have nothing. Also *adsBh* have nothing; and *abGr* omit all kings after the second *Satānika*.

For notices of the earliest of these kings elsewhere see Introdn. § 2. The kings named are 29 altogether, 25 from and including *Adhisimākṛṣṇa*; but the list of *Early Contemporary Dynasties*, l. 6, *infra*, mentions '36 Kauravas'.

Abhimanyoh Parikṣit tu¹
putrah para-puraṁ-jayah
Janamejayaḥ³ Parikṣitaḥ
putrah parama-dhārmikah
Janamejayāc Chatānikas⁶
tasmā jajāne sa vīryavān⁷

putro 'śvamedhadatto 'bhūc⁸ Chatānikasya vīryavān
putro 'śvamedhadattād vai jātaḥ para-puraṁ-jayah⁹
Adhisimākṛṣṇo dharm-ātmā¹⁰ sāmpratam yo¹¹ mahā-yaśāḥ¹²

Uttarāyām tu Vairātyām
Parikṣid¹ Abhimanyu-jah²
Parikṣitas tu dāyādo⁴
rāj-āsiḥ⁵ Janamejayaḥ
tasya putraḥ Śatāniko⁶
balavān satya-vikramah

5

¹ *Parikṣita-su-* in *mMt*. All agree in this name. *Parikṣit*'s name is often written in the MSS in other ways, as *Parikṣita*, *Parikṣi*, *Parikṣa*, &c.; these variations are left unnoticed here. *Bh* begins with a verse about his birth as told in the *MBh*, and *Vṣ* amplifies it in high literary style.

² *Abhimanyunā* in *bVā*.

³ All agree in this name. There is a redundant syllable in this and the next line, and it occurs elsewhere with the name *Janamejaya*. The name was sometimes treated as *Janmejaya* (as in *csjMt* here), thus obviating the superfluous syllable.

⁴ *Parikṣitasya* (omitting *tu*) in *bVā*. *Bh* says *Parikṣit* had three other sons—

Tav-eme tanayās tāta Janamejaya-pūrvakāḥ
Śrutaseno Bhīmasena Ugrasenaś ca vīryavān.

Vīrasena for *Bhīmasena* in *rtBh*. *Vṣ* concurs in this; so also *MBh* i, 3, 661–2.

⁵ *Rājā* sa in *kVā*.

⁶ All agree in this name. *Vṣ* styles him *aparah Śatānikah*, with reference to an earlier *Śatānika*, who was son of *Nakula* and *Draupadī* and was killed in the great battle. *Bh* is fuller and contains these two lines—

tasya putraḥ Śatāniko Yājñavalkyāt
trayīm paṭhan

astra-jñānaṁ kriyā-jñānaṁ Śaunakāt
param eṣyati.

Vṣ agrees, and expands this statement, improving it by reading *Kṛpāj jñānaṁ* instead of *kriyā-jñānaṁ*. *MBh* says *Janamejaya* had a second son, *Śaṅkukarṇa* (i, 95, 3837–8).

⁷ *Su-vīryavān* in *jMt*.

⁸ So *Vā*; *hMt* agrees but has *vai* for 'bhūc'. *Mt* *crp* *ath-Āśvamedhena tataḥ* (*fgMt* *sutah*); *kMt* omits this line. *Vṣ* and *Gr* give the name as *Āśvamedhadatta*; *kVṣ* *°dātṛ*; *Bh* as *°medhaja*. Between him and the preceding *Śatānika* *Bh* inserts a king *Sahasrānika* thus—

Sahasrānikas tat-putras tataś c-aiv-Āśvamedhajah.

but no other authority supports it.

⁹ So *Vā*: *kVā* *pura-puraṁ*. *Mt* omits this line, condensing it with the next.

¹⁰ So *Vā* except that the name varies; all have a superfluous syllable: *hVā* *Adhisimākṛṣṇo*; *Cu²a⁴Vā* *°sāmak^o*; *gVā* *°sāmah Kṛṣṇo*; *a¹Vā* *°māsak^o*; *a³Vā* *°masak^o*; *kVā* *Adhimak^o*. *Mt* genly *jajāne 'dhisomākṛṣṇ-ākhyah*; *fgMt* *°simak^o*; *jMt* both; *eMt* *°simah Kṛṣṇo*; *nMt* *+Adhinsamak^o*; *pMt* *Adhisomākṛṣṇasyah*; *bMt* *°kṛṣṇasya*; *dMt* *°simah Kṛṣṇasyah*; *gMt* *°simākṛṣṇas ca*; *hMt* *āsīt Kṛṣṇa sutas tasya*: *jMat* misplaces this line after l. 3. *Mt* readings seem to

PAURAVAS

5

Adhisimākṣṇa-putro¹³ Nicakṣur¹⁴ bhavitā nṛpaḥ¹⁵
 Gaṅgayāpahrte¹⁶ tasmin nagare Nāgāsāhvaye¹⁷
 tyaktvā Nicakṣur nagaram¹⁸ Kauśāmbiyām sa¹⁹ nivatsyati²⁰
 bhaviṣyāṣṭau²¹ sutās tasya²² mahā-bala-parākramāḥ²³ 10
 Bhūrir²⁴ jyēsthah²⁵ sutas tasya
 tasya²⁷ Citrarathah²⁸ smṛtah | bhaviṣyad Uṣṇas tat-putra²⁶
 Uṣṇac Citrarathah²⁸ smṛtah

be corruptions of *Adhisimākṣṇo'sya* in Pkt form *°kṣṇa asya*. V_s *Adhisimākṣṇa*; kV_s *°simah Kṛṣ°*; Gr *°simakah Kṛṣ°*. Bh *Asimākṣṇas tasy-āpi*; hBh *Asiśāk°*; fBh *avātsūt Kṛṣ°*; gBh *crp*. In two later lines (omitted here) *a'a'a'Mt* (verse 77) and *a'a'Vā* (verse 270) have *Adhisimāk°*. The correct name appears to be *Adhisimākṣṇa*, with a shorter form *Asimāk°*. The longer form is best supported here, though the shorter would improve the metre.

¹¹ So Mt: jMt *sa*. Vā *sāmprato 'yam*. See corresponding lines about Divākara of the Aikṣvākus and Senājit of the Bārhadrathas, *infra*.

¹² So Vā, Mt genly: *a'ceknMt mahārathah*. After this line Mt and Vā insert three lines stating that the twelve-year sacrifice was performed during his reign; see *Introdn.* § 10.

¹³ So Mt, Vā, except that there are variations in the name; cMt adds *'bhūt* and *CGVā'a'jMt tu* superfluously: *a'a'deMt*, *ghVā Adhisimāḥ Kṛṣṇa-putro*; kMt *°māsah K°*; dVā *Asimāk°*; nMt merely *Kṛṣṇa-putro*; eVā *Dadhīcikṛṣṇa-suto*. Bh says *tat-sutah*, 'son of the preceding'.

¹⁴ There is great variation in this name here and in l. 9. Mt often *Vivakṣu*; bgMt *Vicakṣus*; dMt both; hMt *Nṛcakru*; a'cenMt *Nṛcaka*: afterwards fMt *Nicakṣus*, iMt *Nṛvakṣu*, kMt *Nṛcaka*. Vā genly *Nṛvaktra*; eVā *Nṛvadhā* here. V_s genly *Nicakṣus*; bcdffjV_s, jMt, tBh *Nicakru*; lV_s *Niścakru*; kV_s *crp*: aGr *+Nivadra?*; bGr *+Niraka?*; CGr *Aniruddha*. Bh genly *Nemicakra*; eBh *Nemimśc°*; nBh *Naimic°*; rBh, aV_s *Nic°*. I have adopted *Nicakṣus* as the most central form; but the true name may be *Nṛcakṣas*, a word occurring in *Rigv.* x, 14, 11.

¹⁵ So Mt. Vā *kila*.

¹⁶ So Vā, cenMt. Mt genly *Gaṅgayā tu*

hrte; bMt *°dhrte*; mMt both; dMt *brte*.

¹⁷ Similarly V_s—yo *Gaṅgayāpahrte Hastināpure Kauśāmbiyām nivatsyati*. Bh also—*Gajāhvaye hrte nadyā Kauśāmbiyām sādhu vatsyati*:

where gBh *°sa tu vat°*; rBh *°sa nivat°*; pBh ends *neṣyati*.

¹⁸ So Mt genly with variations in the name, see note ¹¹: *a'a'ceknMt Nṛcako nagaram tyaktvā*; hMt *°svam vāṁśam tyaktvā*: eVā *tyaktvā Nṛbandhu vāsam* (with a syll. lost). Vā genly *tyaktvā (gVā kṛtvā) ca tam sa vāsam ca*; CVā *°su-vāsam°*; dVā *°tam tu vāsam svam*; hVā *°nam sarvāsa va*; bVā *+nya[ttakam]tkām ca nam sa vāsa va*. These variations suggest the reading, *tyaktvā ca tam sva-vāsam* (or *vāṁśam*) *ca*.

¹⁹ So Vā genly (gVā omits *sa*) and rBh; lVā *+Kauśāmdyām°*; fMt *sa Kauśāmbiyām*; gMt *sa Kauśāvya*. Mt genly *Kauśāmbiyām tu*; jMt *°su*; dMt *+Kauśānām*; hMt *+Kauśālyāntu*. V_s, Bh corroborate; eBh *+Kauśikyām*; kV_s *Kauśak°*.

²⁰ So Mt, Vā genly, V_s: bVā *niveṣyati*; hVā *niveṣ°*; dVā *niveṣmani*; gVā *sannivetsyati*.

²¹ This line is only in Mt, but not in *dfj* jMt: *a'Mt bhaviṣyās ca*; hMt *°syē yah*; mpMt *°syākṣau*; kMt omits *aṣṭau*: eVā has only the first half line, *bhaviṣyas tu sutas tasmāt*.

²² *C-aiva* in *a'Mt*.

²³ In hMt *Uṣṇa Citraratha smṛtah*.

²⁴ *Bhūri* in *bdfjgkpMt*; hMt *Bhūri*; iMt *Bhūmi*.

²⁵ In hMt *śreṣṭhah*.

²⁶ So Vā. V_s *tasy-āpy Uṣṇah putro*. CGr *Uṣṇa*; abGr *Uśca?*; Bh *Ukta*; tBh *Upta*.

²⁷ *Tatas* in *bcefjghpMt*; mMt both; jMt *tatra*.

²⁸ All agree in this name, except eVā *Tvaṣṭā Dhitrarathah*.

Śucidrathas²⁹ Citrarathād³⁰ Vṛṣṇimāms³¹ ca Śucidrathāt
 Vṛṣṇimataḥ Suṣeṇas ca³² bhaviṣyati śucir nṛpaḥ³³
 tasmāt Suṣeṇād bhavitā Sunītho³⁴ nāma pārthivah³⁵
 Rucāḥ³⁶ Sunīthād³⁷ bhavitā³⁸ Nṛcakṣur³⁹ bhavitā tataḥ⁴⁰
 Nṛcakṣusas⁴¹ tu dāyādo bhavitā vai⁴² Sukhībalaḥ⁴³
 Sukhībala-sutas cāpi⁴⁴ bhāvi⁴⁵ rājā Pariplavaḥ⁴⁶
 Pariplava-sutas cāpi⁴⁷ bhavitā Sunayo⁴⁸ nṛpaḥ

15

²⁹ So Vā, fJMt; CGr agrees: *ceghnMt Śucidratha*; *a²a³kMt Suvid°*; *hVṣ* either; *bMt*, *kVā Śucidravya*, so *dpMt* with *°dravāt* at the end: other *Mt Śucidrava*. *Vṣ* genly *Śuciratha*; *cVṣ Suvir°* Bh *Kaviratha* and *Kuvir°* about equally; *jBh Tuvir°*; *fBh Kathir°*; *rsBh Sucir°*. The proper form should probably be *Sucadratha*. Omitted in *dLVṣ*, *abGr*.

³⁰ *Caitraratho* in *a²a³kMt*; *enMt Cit°*. Bh says *sutah*.

³¹ So *Mt* genly; *Vṣ*, *fjklqBh*, CGr agree in the name: *npMt Viṣṇumāms*; *cejnMt Vṛṣṭim°*: in next line *pMt Vṛṣṇimataḥ*; *lMt Vṛṣṭi°*; *nMt Vṛṣi°*. Vā genly *Dhṛtimāms*; *dVā Dhṛtam°*; *gVā Vṛṭtim°*; *bVā Vṛtyam°*; *hVā Vṛnam°*; *kVā Vṛttirmāns*. Bh genly, *abVṣ Vṛṣṭimat*; *tBh Vṛti°*; *rBh Dhṛti°*; *eBh Dhṛṣṭi°*; *cBh Kṛṣṭi°*. Omitted in *abGr*.

³² So *Mt* genly: *eVā Suṣeṇa Dhṛtimato* (with one syll. short). Vā genly *Suṣeṇo vai mahāvīryo*. Bh, *Vṣ*, CGr agree in the name; *kVṣ Susena*. With the dialectical modification of *s*, *cenMt* read *Sukheṇas tu*, so *gVā* and *hVṣ*; *bVṣ*, *knpBh Sukhena*: *lMt Sukhanas tu*. Omitted in *abGr*.

³³ So *Mt* genly: *cfghjklmMt punar nṛpaḥ*; *eMt panu°*. Vā genly *mahāyāsāḥ*; *eVā punaḥ punaḥ*.

³⁴ So *Mt* genly, *eVā*. *Vṣ*, Bh agree; CGr *Sunīthaka*; *kBh Sunītha*: *jMt Sunīyo*; *mpMt Sunipo*, *pMt Sunīthād* in next line. Vā genly *Sutīrtho*. Omitted in *abGr*.

³⁵ *Dhārmikah* in *eVā*.

³⁶ So Vā genly; *gVā Ruciḥ*. *Vṣ* genly *Reaḥ*; *kVṣ Rta*; *jVṣ Amca*; *eVā sa vai*. *Mt nṛpāt*. Bh, *hLVṣ*, Gr omit him.

³⁷ *Sunīto* in *eVā*. Vā *Sutīrthād*.

³⁸ *Samjanye* in *kMt*.

³⁹ So *Mt* genly; *Vṣ*, Bh, Gr agree genly: *cknMt Nṛcakra*, *eMt Nuc°*. Vā genly *Tricakṣo*; *bdVā °vakṣyo*; *gVā Citrākṣo*; *a²klVā*

Vivakṣo; *eVā Nṛvandhur*. Others, *pBh Nṛcakru*; *cBh Nṛpakṣu*; *fBh Sucakṣus*; *aVṣ Nuc°*, *kVṣ Ntao°*, *bVṣ Tric°*: see note ⁴¹.

⁴⁰ So Vā. *Mt su-mahāyāsāḥ*; *dMt sa°*; *fghMt tu°*.

⁴¹ Readings here genly follow those in note ³⁹: but *bpMt Nṛcakṣusasya* (omitting *tu*), *lMt Vivakṣasas*: *lVā Trivakṣasya*, *kVā °kṣyasya*, *bVā °vikṣyasya*; *gVā Citrākhyasya*; *eVā Nṛvandhuyas*.

⁴² In *fjMt °ca*: *cehknMt bhaviṣyati*.

⁴³ So *Mt*, Vā genly, here and in next line: *bdVā Suṣib°*; *nMt Sukhīlava*, *jMt Sukhel°*, *cMt Mukhīl°*; *ekMt na samśayaḥ*: but in next line *cMt Sukhīlava*, *ekMt °itala*. *bVā Suradhīla*. *Vṣ* genly *Sukhābala*, *lVṣ Sukhab°*, *abhkVṣ Sukhūb°*. Bh genly *Sukhīnala*, *pBh °nara*; *fBh Suṣīnara*; *rBh Sukhānana*. CGr *Mukhābāna*; *aGr Surabala*, *bGr °baja*. This name omitted in *eVā*. After him Gr adds, *medhāvī ca nṛpañjayaḥ*, implying aptly two other kings, but no authority supports it.

⁴⁴ In *dVā sutah sūta*; *bVā tsuta[mṛ]tasi*; *ekMt tvaśas cāpi*. Bh *sutas tasmāt*.

⁴⁵ So *Mt* genly. Vā, *cnMt bhāvno*, *eMt bha°*; *hMt bhaviṣyati* (omitting *rājā*).

⁴⁶ So many *Mt*, *a²a³Vā*, here and in next line. *Vṣ*, Bh agree genly; and *abGr*: *bgrtBh*, CGr *Pāriplava*; *Ca'a²Vā Paripluta*. *CGVa°lMt*, *ghVṣ*, *cBh Pariṣṇava*; *kMt °ṣṇuva*. The letters *pl* and *ṣṇ* are often written very much alike; so *eMt °ṣṇuva* here, *°pluva* in next line: *gVā °pluta*, *°plava*; *kVā °pluva*, *°plava*: *bVā °śraya*, *°plava*; *kVṣ °puna*; *dVā °ślagha*; *cfVṣ Paritṛava*: *lVā* substitutes here *Daṇḍapāṇir bhaviṣyati* from l. 25.

⁴⁷ This line omitted in some, see p. 3.

⁴⁸ So Vā genly, *kMt*; *Vṣ* genly, CGr agree: also Bh impliedly, *Medhāvī Sunay-ātmajah*. *Mt* genly *Sutapā*; *jMt °tamā*: *tBh °tapa*; *pBh °daya*; *kVṣ °raya*; *kMt nṛpo*; *eVā*

PAURAVAS

7

Medhāvī⁴⁹ tasya dāyādo⁵⁰ bhaviṣyati narādhipaḥ⁵¹
 Medhāvinah sutaś c-āpi⁵² bhaviṣyati Nrpañjayaḥ⁵³ 20
 Durvo⁵⁴ bhāvyaḥ sutas tasya⁵⁵ Tigmātmā⁵⁶ tasya c-ātmajaḥ⁵⁷
 Tigmād⁵⁸ Brhadratho⁵⁹ bhāvyo Vasudāno⁶⁰ Brhadrathāt
 Vasudānāc⁶¹ Chatāniko⁶² bhaviṣy-Ōdayanas⁶³ tataḥ⁶⁴
 bhaviṣyate c-Ōdayanād⁶⁵ viro rājā⁶⁶ Vahīnaraḥ⁶⁷
 Vahīnar-ātmajaś⁶⁸ c-aiva⁶⁹ Daṇḍapāṇir⁷⁰ bhaviṣyati 25
 Daṇḍapāṇer Nirāmitro Nirāmitrāt⁷¹ tu⁷² Kṣemakaḥ⁷³

⁴⁹ ratho: bgVā, acdeghVś, abGr Munaya; hVā Munapa; lMt Muṣṇavo; ceMt Putrayo; nMt Putrāpo; rBh Vijāna.

⁵⁰ So all: but hBh Modhāvin; kBh Me-ghāvin.

⁵¹ So Mt, eVā. Vā genly Sunayasy-ātha; bgVā Munay; hVā Munany-ātha. Bh Sunay-ātmajaḥ.

⁵² So Vā: eVā nrpaḥ sa tu; hMt nayasya tu. Mt genly na saṁsayah.

⁵³ So Mt and Vā.

⁵⁴ So eVā. Bh, Vś, Gr agree. Mt Purāñj; bVś Ripuñj; lVś Nrpanaya. See p. 3.

⁵⁵ There is great variation in this name. Mt mostly Urvo; ceMt Ūru; hMt Uror; jMt Ūrvyā; gMt Urvyau, fMt Ūr; nMt Ūru (or Kuru); pMt Kurvo; dMt Jayo. But eVā Durvi. Bh genly Dūro; nBh Dur; ceBh Dar; rBh Dār; pBh Purva. Vś genly Mrdu; fVś da; hVś Durva, lVś Dūr; abVś Durbala; kVś Durddharṣa. Gr Hari. Durva is the most central form.

⁵⁶ C-āpi in eVā.

⁵⁷ So Mt genly; eVā shortly Tigmāms. Vś, Gr Tigma, which Mt and eVā use in next line. Bh Tīmī; hMt Tīmātmā, ceknMt Nirm; fgMt Nirm-ākhyas; jMt tNin-dātmā.

⁵⁸ In eVā tasmād bhaviṣyati; Bh janīṣyati.

⁵⁹ So Mt genly, eVā: bMt mātāmād, dMt mātmano, with excess syll: pMt Tigmā; hMt Tīmād; cefgknMt Nirmād; jMt tNindā.

⁶⁰ All agree in this name.

⁶¹ So hMt, eVā; Vś agrees: dMt Vasudānā. Mt genly dāmā; kMt dhāmā; ceMt dhāmā; cnMt dhāma; jMt devo: lVś da; bVś manas. CGr Sudānaka; abGr tTrudānava misplacing him after the next king Satānika. Bh Sudāsa indirectly, Satānikah Sudāsa-jah; bBh Sudāru-jah.

⁶² So hMt, eVā. Mt genly dāmnaḥ; bMt

dāmna; enMt dhāmā; ceMt dhāmāc; jMt dāsuh.

⁶³ All agree; eMt Sat: abGr Sudānika, Pkt. Vś calls him aparah Satānikah; for the former see note⁶⁴. Bh says 'son of the preceding', see note⁶⁵.

⁶⁴ So Mt genly; Vś: eVā bhavit-Ōdaya-ya[m]s here, Udayanād in next line: jMt bhaviṣy-Ōdayinah; eMt syadayanah; dmpMt sy-Ōdathanah; kMt syadanayah. CGr Udāna. Bh genly Durdamana; enBh Durd or Urd; ceBh Umanasu (or Dum).

⁶⁵ Tathā in bckjnpMt, eVā.

⁶⁶ See note⁶⁷. Other variations here are, cjnMt syataś c (so kMt crp); CMt syate ca Dayanād; dpMt c-Ōdathanād; eMt bhavitaś c-Ōdayanād; eVā bhaviṣyaś c-āpy Udayanād.

⁶⁷ Jāto in dMt.

⁶⁸ So Mt genly; Bh, ablVś agree: pBh Vrah; Vś genly Ah; hVś Ah; CGr Ahn; gBh Vahīnana: ceBh Mt Mahīnaraḥ, fgMt rataḥ, here and in next line.

⁶⁹ So Mt; eVā ra-sutaś: lMt Mahīsar-ātma.

⁷⁰ C-āpi in eVā; mpMt c-Aindro.

⁷¹ So Mt; and Vā which resumes the list here. Bh, bklVś, CGr agree. Vś genly Khandā; fVś that or Khadya.

⁷² So Vā, CbdefgjnMt; jVś. ApMt, bghVś Nira; hMt Nirva. Vś genly Nara; aVś Ni. CGr Nimitaka. Bh genly, klVś Nimi; ceBh Nima; nBh Nini; tBh Nidhi; jBh Niti; rBh Muni. This half line in eVā is bhavitā Kṣemakas tathā.

⁷³ So Mt. Vā ca.

All agree in this name; but lVś Kṣema; a'gkVā Kṣepakaḥ; jVś, lBh Kṣamaka; kVś Cākṣuka. All agree in Kṣemaka in l. 30.

pañca-vimśā⁷⁴ nṛpā hy ete⁷⁵ bhaviṣyāḥ Pūru⁷⁶-vaṁśa-jāḥ
 atrānuvaṁśa⁷⁷-śloko 'yaṁ gīto vipraiḥ purāṇanaiḥ⁷⁸
 brahma-kṣatrasya⁷⁹ yo yonir vaṁśo⁸⁰ deva-rṣi⁸¹-satkṛtaḥ⁸²
 Kṣemakam prāpya rājānaṁ saṁsthāṁ prāpsyati vai Kalau⁸³ 36
 ity eṣa Pauravo vaṁśo⁸⁴ yathāvad anukīrtitaḥ⁸⁵
 dhīmataḥ Pāṇḍu-putrasya Arjunasya⁸⁶ mahātmanah⁸⁷.

Aikṣvākus.

Text—AMt 271, 4-17^a; AVā 99, 280^b-293; Bḍ iii, 74, 104-107^a.

Corresp. passages—CVṣ iv, 22; GBh ix, 12, 9-16; CGr i, 141, 5-8.

The Matsya and Vāyu give the whole. The Brahmanḍa has a lacuna and its account begins only at l. 23. The Bhāgavata gives a list of names with a few particulars. The Viṣṇu and Garuḍa have only a list of names.

Line 1 is only in Vā. Otherwise all copies of Mt and Vā have the dynasty complete, except that jMt omits ll. 4-7; eVā ll. 19-21; gVā ll. 5, 7-14, 24, 25; lVā l. 24; hpMt have lost the whole; and fjmVā begin only at l. 23. In jBh kings Śākya to Kṣudraka (inclusive) are omitted; in nBh Śākya to Suratha; in pBh Rājanjaya to Suddhodana; in cVṣ Śākya to Kulaka; in kVṣ all after Śākya except the genealogical verse; and adBh have nothing.

There is confusion regarding the first two kings, for Vā, Vṣ, and Bh name two, but Mt and Gr make them one only. This piece of the dynasty, with so much of the various readings as concerns these two kings, stands thus:—

⁷⁴ This line is only in Vā; dVā °ḥan; gVā °ḥa: eVā °irīmśan. These 25 kings are Adhisimākṣṇa and his successors, see l. 6; but see *Early Contemporary Dynasties*, l. 6, *infra*.

⁷⁵ Nṛp-ādyā te in bVā.

⁷⁶ Vā genly pūrva; eVā Pūru. The correct reading is clearly Pūru, from whom the Pauravas were descended.

⁷⁷ In hMt °vaṁśaḥ; nMt °vaṁśya: bḍpMt ato 'nuvaṁśa-ḥ; eVā tatr-ān°: dVā Pūru-vaṁśasya; kVā anuv°, hVā °śayā: gVā omits atra.

⁷⁸ So Mt genly; nMt +surāt°; fgMt sanāt°. Vā genly purā-vidaiḥ; eVā paurāṇikair dvijaiḥ.

⁷⁹ This verse is in Mt, Vā, Vṣ, Bh.

⁸⁰ In hMt yā yonir°; BrBh vai yonir°. Bh genly vai prokto°; bfhjknpgBh vaṁśo 'yam prokto.

⁸¹ Vṣ rājarsi; aVṣ devarsi.

⁸² In nMt saṁk°; cMt saṁsk°; eMt tsajñitah; kMt tsamjñinah.

⁸³ So Vā, Bh, lVṣ. Mt MSS have two endings: (1) saṁsthāsyati Kalau yuge, (2) saṁsthāsyati sa (or ca) vai Kalau; jMt °sthāpyanti ca ye°. Vṣ sa saṁsthām (k, saṁsthānam) prāpsyate Kalau. Cf. p. 12, note⁷⁹.

⁸⁴ But eVā ity evam Pauravaṁ vaṁśam.

⁸⁵ So Vā, ceknMt; eVā °tam. Mt genly iha kīrtitah.

⁸⁶ So Vā, Mt genly; AbklmMt c-Ārjunasya; dVā dharma-jñasya; eVā reads this half line Pārthasya prathī-ātmanah.

⁸⁷ Gr after naming Kṣemaka says, tataḥ śūdraḥ pitā pūrvas tataḥ sutah, suggesting that two śūdra kings, father and son, reigned after him.

- Mt* Brhadbalasya dāyādo viro rājā hy ¹ Urukṣayah ²
 Urukṣaya³-sutaś c-āpi ⁴ Vatsadroho mahāyasaḥ ⁵.
Vā Brhadrathasya ⁶ dāyādo viro rājā Brhatkṣayah ⁷
 tataḥ Kṣayah sutas ⁸ tasya Vatsavyūhas tataḥ Kṣayāt.
Vś. Vṛhadbalasya putro Vṛhatkṣaṇaḥ ⁹
 tasmād Gurukṣepaḥ ¹⁰ tato Vatsaḥ ¹¹ Vatsād Vatsavyūhaḥ.
Bh. Brhadbalasya bhavitā putro nāma Brhadraṇaḥ ¹²
 Urukriyas ¹³ tatas tasya Vatsavṛddho bhaviṣyati.
Gr. Vṛhadbalād ¹⁴ Urukṣayo Vatsavyūhas tataḥ paraḥ.

A comparison of these readings with possible mistakes in letters in the various old scripts suggests that Vā, Bh, and Vś are right in naming two kings, that their names appear to be Brhatkṣaya and Urukṣaya, and that Mt and Gr have confused them as one. Hence it seems the text of Mt and Vā should be emended thus:—

Brhadbalasya dāyādo viro rājā Brhatkṣayah
 Urukṣayah sutas tasya Vatsavyūha Urukṣayāt.

The number of kings in this dynasty is not stated, but 29 are named, excluding Siddhārtha: see however *Early Contemporary Dynasties*, *infra*.

Ata ūrdhvam pravakṣyāmi Ikṣvākūṇām mahātmanām ¹
 Brhadbalasya ² dāyādo viro rājā Brhatkṣayah ³
 Urukṣayah ³ sutas tasya Vatsavyūha ⁴ Urukṣayāt
 Vatsavyūhāt ⁵ Prativyomas ⁶ tasya putro ⁷ Divākaraḥ ⁸

¹ *Hy* omitted in *bedefgjkMt*.

² In *jMt* *Uruk*^o; *dkMt* *Kuruk*^o; *ceMt* *Nurak*^o; *lMt* *Nuk*^o.

³ See note ²; *eMt* *Surak*^o: *nMt* *Urukṣayas*.

⁴ In *nMt* *tu tasy-āpi*.

⁵ In *gMt* *mamā*^o; *nMt* *mahātapaḥ*.

⁶ *Brhadbalasya* in *eVā*.

⁷ In *hVā* *ikṣavaḥ*; *dVā* *ivayaḥ*; *bVā* *drathaḥ*.

⁸ *Kṣaya sutas* in *bVā*: *eVā* omits this line.

⁹ In *kVś* *ksvenah*; *gVś* *ksetraḥ*; *bVś* *ksantah*; *fVś* *Brhataksaṇaḥ*.

¹⁰ So *dVś* or *Uruk*^o: *jVś* *Urukṣaprah*: *abhVś* *Urukṣayah*; *kVś* *Vaṛuk*^o; *lVś* *Puruśak*^o.

¹¹ But *lVś* omits him.

¹² In *lnBh* *vraṇaḥ*; *cBh* *Dharudraṇaḥ*.

¹³ In *cBh* *kṛiśas*?; *hBh* *Kurukriyas*; *rBh* *Upāvritas*.

¹⁴ *Vṛhanraṇād* in *abGr*.

¹ This line is only in *Vā*. *Vś*, *Gr* have similar statements.

² *Vā* genly, *fgMt* *rathasya*, but *Brhadbala* correctly in l. 24. *Brhadbala*, king of Kosala, is mentioned in the *MBh*.

³ For this line, see above.

⁴ So *Vā* genly, *a'ā'a'bkMt*. *Vś*, *Gr* agree. In *klVā* *vyūhas*; *fgMt* *vyāho*, *dMt* *dāho*, in next line *dgMt* *dvūhāt*; *jMt* *erp*; *eMt* *Vaśavyūho*; *nMt* *Vṛtsamūho* and *Vatsavyūhāt*. *Mt* genly *Vatsadroho*: *Bh* *vṛddha*, *tBh* *vṛiha*: *hVś* *Vyūha*. *Vś* (except *lVś*) inserts a king *Vatsa* before him (see above), but no other authority supports it.

⁵ *Vyūdhāt* merely in *eVā*.

⁶ So *Mt* genly. *Vś*, *Bh*, *abGr* agree. In *eVā* *Prativyomnas tu*. *Vā* genly, *lVś* *vyūhas*; *gMt* *vyogo*; *rBh* *vyota*; *jVś* *cyoma*; *kVś* *Pratīcyāma*. *CGr*, *hVś* omit him.

⁷ *Vyoma-putro* in *fgMt*.

⁸ So *Mt*, *Vā*, *Vś*. *Bh* *Bhānur Divāko vāhinī-patiḥ*, where *BepBh* read correctly *Divārko*. *Sūrya* in *abGr*. *CGr*, *hVś* omit him.

tasyaiva⁹ Madhyadeśe tu

Ayodhyā nagarī śubhā

Divākaraśya bhavitā¹¹ Sahadevo¹² mahā-yaśāḥSahadevasya¹³ dāyādo¹⁴ Bṛhadaśvo¹⁵ mahā-manāḥ¹⁶tasya Bhānuratho bhāvyaḥ¹⁷ Pratitāśvaś¹⁸ ca tat-sutaḥPratitāśva-sutaś cāpi Supratiko¹⁹ bhaviṣyatiMarudevaḥ²⁰ sūtas tasya²¹ Sunakṣatraś²² ca tat-sutaḥ²³Kinnarāśvaḥ²⁴ Sunakṣatrād bhaviṣyati paraiṇ-tapaḥKinnarād Antarikṣas tu²⁵bhaviṣyati mahā-manāḥ²⁷Suśeṇaś²⁸ cĀntarikṣāc ca²⁹Sumitraś cāpy³² Amitrajit³³

yaś ca sāmpratam adhyāste

Ayodhyāṁ¹⁰ nagarīm nrpaḥ 5bhavitā cĀntarikṣas tu²⁶

Kinnarasya suto mahān

Antarikṣāt Suparnaś³⁰ tu³¹Suparnāc cāpy³⁴ Amitrajit³³

⁹ So Mt genly: °aiśā in cdefgmnMt. Cf corresponding lines about Adhisimākṣṇa (p. 4, l. 6) and Senājit (p. 15, l. 13).

¹⁰ So Vā: gVā omits this line.

¹¹ Sahitā in eMt.

¹² So all, except that gVā reads—
Divākara-sutaś cāpi cakravartī bhaviṣyati.
CGr, hVś omit him.

¹³ In CmMt °devāc ca.

¹⁴ So Vā. Mt bhavitā.

¹⁵ So Vā. Vś, Bh, Gr agree: kVś °drutha.
Mt genly Dhruvāśvo vai; cenMt °v-ākhyo°:
hVś omits him.

¹⁶ So Mt: cnMt °yaśāḥ. Vā bhaviṣyati.

¹⁷ So Vā genly; Vś, Gr agree: bhVā Bhātu°.
Bh Bhānumant; hBh Vān°: bhVś omit him.
Mt corrupts this half line, gjMt bhāvya-
ratho bhāvyaḥ, fMt bhāvya°, bMt bhāvyo°,
dmMt bhāvyo rathā°; lMt °rathodbhāv°:
genly bhāvyo mahābhāgaḥ. Vś says, 'son
of the preceding', tat-sūnur.

¹⁸ So Vā, bdfgnMt; abhkVś agree. Mt
genly Pratipōśvaś; kMt Pranītā°. In bBh
Pratikāśva: Bh genly Pratikāśva; cfhknprBh
°kāsa: CGr °vya; abGr °cyu: jMt Pracetās
tasya (omitting ca), but Pratitāśva in next
line: lMt marutaś cāpi. Vś genly omits him.

¹⁹ So kMt; Vś, Bh agree. Vā genly Su-
ratito; eVā °nito: Mt genly °tīpo; fgMt
°tāpo: mMt Suprītāyo; lMt Suvratopo.
CGr Pratītaka; rBh Pratika; abGr °tikṣaka.
Bh says, 'son of the preceding', tat-sutaḥ.

²⁰ So Mt; Vś, Bh agree: jBh Marad°;
lVś Maru[da]d°; mMt, Gr, bpBh Manud°;
Vā Sahad°; cBh Suhad°.

²¹ Cāpi in eVā.

²² So all; except rBh Svan°; eBh Sutaḥk°;
hBh Sunakṣetra: cMt Sukṣatras tat; eMt
†Svakṣatrasvat; mMt Sutakṣas tu, but
Sutakṣatāt in next line; jMt Sutaḥkṣatas,
but Sutakṣattād in next line.

²³ So Vā: ceMt suto 'bhavat. Mt genly
tuto 'bhavat; dknMt 'bhavet.

²⁴ So Mt genly, eVā; kMt °raśva: nMt
°raś ca; lMt °rāḥ; dMt °rākṣaḥ; fgmMt
°r-ākhyah; jMt °rakṣāt. Vā genly Kin-
naras tu; Vś, Gr agree: bVā °Kannarasya:
rBh Kandara; Bh genly Puṣkara; hBh
°kalu; cBh Puṣpara; tBh Rūṣkara. But
eMt Kinnarāś cākṣaras tadvad; so eMt
erp.

²⁵ So cdefgijklmnMt (with some corruptions);
so bMt, but altered to Kinnarāśvād Anta-
rikṣas which ACMt have. Vś, Bh Antarikṣa;
bfjgkVś °rikṣa; CGr °rikṣaka: abGr Anu-
rakṣaka.

²⁶ So Vā; kVā °rikṣasya: eVā c-Ākṣarīkṣas
tu, but Antarikṣāt in next line.

²⁷ Mahāyaśāḥ in dfmMt.

²⁸ So Mt genly: mMt °sarnaś; cekMt
°varnaś; dfjMt °parnaś; bMt °parvaś; lMt
°pparvaḥ; nMt °kṣatraś; jMt °varnāc.

²⁹ So Mt genly; cenMt °rikṣasya.

³⁰ So Vā: bhVś, Gr agree. Vś Suvarṇa;
jVś Sarvaṇa. Bh Sutapas.

³¹ Tu wanting in kVā.

³² So Mt genly; jMt tu: nMt Sumitrasya-
āpy; bMt Sumantr°; ceMt Suvarṇ°. Sumitra
Amitrajit would be one king.

³³ All agree in this name, except bMt

putras tasya ³⁵ Brhadbhrājo ³⁶ Dharmī ³⁷ tasya sutah smṛtaḥ
 putrah ³⁸ Kṛtañjāyo ³⁹ nāma Dharminah sa ⁴⁰ bhaviṣyati 15
 Kṛtañjaya⁴¹-suto vidvān ⁴² bhaviṣyati ⁴³ Rāṇañjayaḥ ⁴⁴
 bhavitā Sañjayaś ⁴⁵ c'āpi ⁴⁶ viro rājā Rāṇañjayāt
 Sañjayasya ⁴⁷ sutah Śākyah ⁴⁸ Śākyac ⁴⁹ Chuddhodano ⁵⁰ 'bhavat ⁵¹
 Śuddhodanasya ⁵² bhavitā Siddhārtho ⁵³ Rāhulāḥ ⁵⁴ sutah ⁵⁵
 Prasenajit ⁵⁶ tato bhāvyaḥ ⁵⁷ Kṣudrako ⁵⁸ bhavitā ⁵⁹ tataḥ ⁶⁰ 20
 Kṣudrakāt Kulako ⁶¹ bhāvyaḥ Kulakāt ⁶² Surathaḥ ⁶³ smṛtaḥ ⁶⁴

Amantrajit; CGr Krtajit; abGr Śatajit: jMt tato bhavet.

³⁴ So Vā; dMt also: dVā *Parṇāc*.

³⁵ So Vā. Mt genly *Sumitra-jo*; bMt *triyo*; jMt *trāt tu*.

³⁶ Mt genly *Brhadrāja*; Vś, Bh genly agree. But hVś, bqtBh, CGr *dbhrāja*; hklpBh *dbhāja*; nMt, abGr *dvāja*; fBh *dgātra*; cBh *dbhānu*; gBh *jjāta*; eBh *Brahmadrāja*; cMt *Mahārāja*. Vā *Bharadvāja*. *Brhadbhrāja* appears to be the probable name.

³⁷ So Vā; Vś agrees: eVā *Dharma*; Gr *Dharmika*. Mt reads this half line *Brhad-rājasya* (d, *rājasya*; n, *vājasya*) *vīryavān* (b, *vīrya-bhāk*; j, *kīrtanāt*), where *vīryavān* is probably a mistake for *Dharmavān* or *Dharmikah*; see note ⁴⁰. Bh *Barhis*.

³⁸ So Vā, *CbedejkmnMt*. Other Mt *punaḥ*.

³⁹ So Mt genly, Vā. Vś, Bh, Gr agree. But fgMt read thus—

Kṛtiñjaya iti khyātaḥ su-putro yo bhaviṣyati:

but fMt *Kṛtañj* in next line. In bVś *Kṛtiñj*: jMt *Vṛhañj*, but *Kṛtañj* in next line.

⁴⁰ So Vā: for sa dVā has *sa-*, eVā *tu*. Mt genly *Dharmikāś ca*; cMt *keś ca*; mMt *ttathākaś ca*. Mt reading should probably be *Dharmikasya* (see note ³⁷). But gVā reads this half line, *rājā parama-dharmikah*.

⁴¹ In *degVā* *jayāt*; *kVā* *jayā*; lMt *Rāṇañjaya*.

⁴² So Mt. Vā genly *Vrāto*: gVā *suta vrāto*, dVā *vrāta*, kVā *vrato*; eVā *svrato vai*. These suggest a king *Vrāta* or *Suvrata*, of whom the other authorities know nothing.

⁴³ So Mt. Vā *tasya putro* to accord with the insertion of *Vrāta*.

⁴⁴ So Vā, *cefgknMt*; Vś, Bh agree. Mt genly *Rañej*; abGr *Rañaj*; gBh *Rñañj*; eVā *Rathāj*: CGr + *Dhanastraya*.

⁴⁵ So all; but gBh *Suñjaya*: lMt reads this half line + *Rāṇañjayaś capisuno*.

⁴⁶ *C-āto* in bMt.

⁴⁷ *Rāṇañjaya* in *cenMt*.

⁴⁸ So all genly: but *cdeMt*, *abVś*, *cfBh* *Śak*; bMt *Śāth*; gMt *Śāj*; fMt *Sāj*; abGr *Kāsyapanya*: *kVā* omits this name in a blank.

⁴⁹ So all; except *ceMt* *Śak*; *dgMt* *Śāj*; fMt *Sāj*; bMt *Śāth*: gVā *rājā*.

⁵⁰ So Vā, *bedjMt*; *bghlVś*, Gr agree: *efgMt* *Sud*. Mt genly *Chuddhaud*; nMt *crp*. Bh *Suddhoda*. Vś genly *Kruddhodana*; dVś *Krod*; aVś *crp*.

⁵¹ So Vā; bVā *bhavet*: eVā *smṛtaḥ*. Mt genly *nṛpaḥ*; *cejnMt* *punaḥ*.

⁵² So Vā, *cdenMt*. Mt genly *Śuddhaud*; *bfgMt* *Suddhod*.

⁵³ So Mt genly; cMt *Śuddhārdha*, eMt *Śru*. Vā *Śākyārthe*; a'a'bdhVā *Śak*. Vś, Bh, Gr omit him.

⁵⁴ So *Ca'a'Vā*; lVś *Rāhula*. Vś genly *Rātula*; a'a'dgklVā *Nāhula*; abhVś, CGr *Bāh*; abGr *Vāph*; bhVā *Nah*; jVś *Gār*. Bh *Lāngala*. In jMt *Prāhula*; fgMt *Prahuta*; Mt genly *Puškala*; eMt *Hasata*; kMt *Hasanaḥ* (cMt *sanah*); lMt *Sukṛtaḥ*.

⁵⁵ So Mt. Vā *smṛtaḥ*; jMt *dhruvaḥ*. Bh *tat-sutaḥ smṛtaḥ*.

⁵⁶ So Mt genly, Vā. Vś, Bh agree. *CeMt* *Prasenaji*; lMt *sannaji*; Gr *Senajit*: lVś omits him.

⁵⁷ *Kṛto* in eMt; jMt *tato bhavyāt*.

⁵⁸ So all; but lVś *Kṣudrajit*: aVś omits him.

⁵⁹ *Mavarā* in eMt.

⁶⁰ In *ceMt* *nṛpaḥ*; nMt *na saḥ*.

⁶¹ So Mt genly: a'dVā *Kuliko*, *Ca'a'a'Vā* *Kṣul*; cMt *Kṣullako*, eMt *Kṣal*; jMt *Tūlako*. Vś *Kundaka*; fMt *Ku[va]pako*;

Sumitraḥ⁶⁵ Surathasyāpi⁶⁶ antyaś ca⁶⁷ bhavitā nṛpaḥ
 eta Aikṣvākavaḥ⁶⁸ proktā⁶⁹ bhaviṣyā ye⁷⁰ Kalau yuge⁷¹
 Brhadbal-ānvaye jātā⁷² bhaviṣyāḥ kula-vardhanāḥ⁷³
 sūrās ca kṛta-vidyās ca satya-sandhā jit-ēndriyāḥ⁷⁴
 niḥśeṣāḥ kathitās c-aiva nṛpā ye vai purātanāḥ⁷⁵
 atr-ānuvaṁśa⁷⁶-śloko 'yaṁ viprair gītaḥ purātanaiḥ⁷⁷
 Ikṣvākūnām ayaṁ vaṁśaḥ Sumitr-ānto bhaviṣyati⁷⁸
 Sumitram prāpya rājānaṁ saṁsthāṁ prāpsyati vai Kalau⁷⁹.

ity evaṁ Mānavo vaṁśaḥ⁸⁰
 prāg eva⁸² samudāhṛtaḥ⁸³

ity evaṁ Mānavam kṣatram⁸¹
 Ailam ca samudāhṛtam⁸⁴ 30

IVs Kurandaka: pBh Kanamka; fBh Ganaka; gBh Sun°; Bh genly Ran°; cBh Rūn°. erBh omit him. CGr Kuḍava; abGr Kuḍara. Gr inserts a king Sumitra before him, misplacing apptly the next king Suratha.

⁶² In jMt Kūl°; fMt Krul°; ceMt Ksull°.

⁶³ So Mt, Vā. Vṣ, Bh agree: kBh Suretha; fMt Surasaḥ; hVṣ Adhiratha; IVs Vidūr° or Vimyūr°. cBh Sunaya; erBh omit him. Gr apptly Sumitra, see note ⁶¹.

⁶⁴ Sutaḥ in cenMt. Bh tanayas tataḥ.

⁶⁵ So all: eVā omits this name.

⁶⁶ So Vā, bdfgjkMt; eMt °thaś c-āpi: other Mt °thāj jāto; AMt adds hy: eVā °thāt tasmāt: IVs says tat-putraś.

⁶⁷ So Vā, nMt; eVā °sa; Mat genly °tu; bVā antya ca. Antyaḥ crp to antaḥ in bMt, abGr; to anyāḥ in CcefgjMt, Vṣ genly; to ataḥ in CGr; to tataś in dVā: so antyaś ca to antasya in gkVā. Bh niḥśānta.

⁶⁸ So bḍhVā, Bḍ. ACMt ete c-Aik°; cenMt, eVā ete Ik°; bdfgMt ity et-Ēk°, jMt °ev-Ēk°. Vā genly eta Aikṣvākavaḥ; mVā ete Aī[la]k-ṣvākavaḥ.

⁶⁹ Bhūpā in jMt.

⁷⁰ So Mt genly, eVā: cejnMt °syanti. Vā, Bḍ bhavitāraḥ.

⁷¹ Kilau purā in jVā.

⁷² So Vā, Bḍ; eVā °tv ete; bcnMt °ānvayā ye tu. Mt genly °ānvayā ye tu: jMt Vṛhad-ba... nṛpā ye tu; cjqBh °balā nṛpāḥ. Vṣ °bal-ānvayāḥ. Bh genly ete Bārhadbal-ānvayāḥ: rtBh ete c-ānāgatā nṛpāḥ.

⁷³ So Mt genly: dMt kṣudra-vaṁdh°, bfgMt

°bāndhavāḥ, eVā putra-bāndh°; kMt kṣatra-bandhavāḥ: jMt kruddha-vaṁdhanāḥ; cenMt śuddha-vaṁśa-jāḥ. Bḍ reads this half line, mahā-vīrya-parākramāḥ. Vā repeats bhavīṭāraḥ Kalau yuge.

⁷⁴ This line is only in Vā and Bḍ.

⁷⁵ This line is only in cenMt.

⁷⁶ Atr-ānubandha in kMt.

⁷⁷ So Mt genly; bcfjgnMt gīto vipraiḥ. Vā bhaviṣya-jñair udāhṛtaḥ; Bḍ bhaviṣyaj-jñ°; dVā bhaviṣyatair (or °nair)°: see Introdn. § 8.

⁷⁸ So all; but jMt Sumitrā te bh°: eMt omits the second half line.

⁷⁹ So all: except that Vṣ, Bh begin yatas tam; rBh eṣyati for prāpsyati; IVs tasmāt for saṁsthāṁ. Vṣ reads the second half line, sa saṁsthāṁ (h, saṁsthānam) prāpsyate Kalau. This line in jMt is—

Sumitraś c-āpi rājā vai saṁsthāṁ prāpsyati kevalam.

⁸⁰ So this line is in Mt genly: bMt Mānavam vaṁśam.

⁸¹ So this line is in Vā, Bḍ: CgkVā †kṣetram: eVā blunders thus—

ity etat Soma-jam kṣatram Aila-jam samudāhṛtam:

for Aila-ja = Soma-ja, and neither term applies to the Aikṣvākus who were Mānavas.

⁸² In bMt Pāṇḍavam; cnMt Ailasya; eMt Elaś ca; kMt †malasa; jMt etaiḥ ca; dMt crp.

⁸³ In bMt °tam: eMt su-mah-ādṛtaḥ; cMt su-mah-ādbhutaḥ.

⁸⁴ Su-suhṛd-gatam in bVā.

Bārhadraṭhas.

Text—AMt 271, 17^b-30^a; AVā 99, 294-309^a; Bḍ iii, 74, 107^b-122^a.

Corresp. passages—CVṣ iv, 23; GBh ix, 22, 45^b-49; CGr i, 141, 9-11.

The Matsya, Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa give the whole, and agree except where noted. The Viṣṇu, Bhāgavata and Garuḍa give merely a list of names. There is some confusion in the Matsya in lines 20, 22, and 24 compared with l. 26, and its version and that of the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa are both given, the Matsya on the left and the other on the right.

Scarcely any copies are complete. L. 15 is only in Vā and Bḍ, and ll. 30, 31 only in jMt. All copies of Mt omit ll. 26-28, except that l. 26 is in *dfgk*Mt and ll. 27, 28 in *cdefgjk*Mt. Other omissions are: *ce*Mt ll. 8, 9, 13, 20, 21, 23-25, and *e*Mt also ll. 29, 32, 33; jMt ll. 8-12, 17-19, 32, 33; kMt ll. 12, 13, 17-23; lMt ll. 8-12, 21-29; mMt ll. 10-12, 14, 24, 25 and misplaces 18-20 after 23; nMt ll. 19 (second half)-22 (first half): *a*¹*a*²Vā ll. 23-25; *b*Vā ll. 16 (second half)-18 (first half); *e*Vā ll. 7-9, 15; *f*Vā l. 25; *g*Vā ll. 21-29; *j*Vā ll. 1 (second half)-2 (first half), 10-12; *l*Vā ll. 8-12; *m*Vā ll. 23-25: *hp*Mt and *l*Vṣ have lost the whole. Vṣ and Bh omit Nirvṛti; rBh also Kṣema, Suvrata, Dharmanetra and Suśrama; and *ab*Gr Senājit and all after Dṛdhasena.

Lines 30, 31 in jMt are perhaps valuable. This dynasty was founded by Bṛhadraṭha, son of Vasu Caidyôparicara, and he and his 9 successors reigned down to the great battle; see JRAS, 1910, pp. 11, 22, 29. From the battle to Senājit 6 kings are named, excluding Senājit who is spoken of as the then reigning king; and from and including him to the end 16 kings are mentioned. There were thus 32 kings altogether, 10 before the battle and 22 after; or from the standpoint of Senājit's reign 16 past and 16 future. Lines 30-31 in jMt take the standpoint of his reign and speak of him and his successors as the 16 future kings, and say *prima facie* their total duration was 723 years; see note ⁹³. Lines 32-33, which are not in jMt, reckon (in a way) from the beginning and speak of all the 32 kings as future since most of them were posterior to the battle; and thus they say the whole dynasty lasted 1000 years. These two statements are not contradictory but are hardly compatible, because taken together they assign 723 years to the last 16 kings and only 277 to the first 16. The total of 1000 years for 32 kings is excessive, and that of 723 years for 16 kings is absurd. But if we can read lines 30-31 as two independent sentences, and treat *teṣāṃ* as applying, not merely to those 16 future kings, but to the Bṛhadraṭhas generally, their purport stands thus—"These 16 kings are to be known as the future Bṛhadraṭhas: and ¹ their kingdom (that is, the kingdom of the Bṛhadraṭhas) lasts 723 years." The total duration then, 723 years, would be within possibility, for the average reign would be about 22½ years. This rendering would of course discredit lines 32-33. If we read *vayo* in jMt with that construction (see note ⁹³), the total period would be 700 years and would give an average reign of just under 22 years, which would be *vimś-ādhikam*.

¹ The position of *ca* does not necessarily discredit this rendering, for *cas* are often inserted anywhere in these accounts.

BĀRHĀDRATHAS

Ata ūrdhvaṃ pravakṣyāmi Māgadha ye Brhadhrathāḥ¹
 Jarāsandhasya ye vaṃśe² Sahadev-ānvaye³ nṛpāḥ
 atitā vartamānās ca⁴ bhaviṣyās ca tathā punaḥ⁵
 prādhānyataḥ pravakṣyāmi gadato me nibodhata⁶
 saṅgrāme Bhārate vṛtte⁷ Sahadeve nipātite⁸
 Somādhis⁹ tasya dāyādo¹⁰ rāj-ābhūt¹¹ sa Girivraje¹²
 pañcāśataṃ¹³ tath-āṣṭau ca¹⁴ samā rājyaṃ akārayat
 Śrutaśravās¹⁵ catuḥ-ṣaṣṭim¹⁶ samās tasy-ānvaye¹⁷ 'bhavat¹⁸
 Ayutāvus¹⁹ tu²⁰ ṣaḍ-vimśad²¹ rājyaṃ varṣāny²² akārayat
 catvāriṃśat²³ samās tasya | samāḥ śataṃ²⁴ Nirāmitro
 Nirāmitro²⁵ divaṃ gataḥ | mahim bhuktvā divaṃ gataḥ 10

¹ So Mt, a³a³a³bdfghVā; also lVā (reading yo): fkmVā Māgadha (m, °dhe) ye Brhadhrathāḥ, Bḍ Māgadho yo B°, jMt Māgadheṣo B°: other Vā Māgadheyān Brhadhrathān: eVā vaṃśe ye vai Vṛhadhrathāt. Bh says—

Atha Māgadha-rājāno bhavitāro vadāmi te; which is not Skt but Pali; see Appendix I, § ii. Vṣ says—

Māgadhānām Vārhadrathānām bhaviṣyānām (kVṣ bhāvinām) anukramam kathayāmi.

² So Vā, Bḍ. Mt pūrveṇa ye Jarāsandhāt, which should prob. be pūrve tu ye J°, cf. jMt sarve ye tu J°. Vṣ says—

atra hi vaṃśe mahābalā Jarāsandha-pradhānā babbhuvuḥ.

See JRAS, 1908, p. 316; and 1910, p. 29.

³ In jMt °devās tu ye; dMt crp.

⁴ Both accus. pl. in cefgmMt; both nom. sing. in jMt.

⁵ So Vā, Bḍ. Mt °ṣyāms (bdj, °ṣyās) ca nibodhata (j, nibodha tān).

⁶ This line only in Vā, Bḍ: eVā prādhānyās tān.

⁷ So Mt; jMt matle. Vā, Bḍ tasmin.

⁸ So Mt, eVā. Vā, Bḍ °devo nipātitaḥ: ceMt yaś ca bhuktā mahi drayam (c, dnyam).

⁹ So Mt, Vā genly. Bḍ, cdefgjVṣ, CGr Somāpi; eVā, bhVṣ °āvi; bnMt °ādi; Vṣ genly °āmi; kVṣ °āri: aVṣ Semāvi; jMt, bVā Samādhi, kVā Sām°. Bh Mārjari. For Somādhis tasya cMt has Sahadevasya, eMt °devo 'sya.

¹⁰ So Mt. Vā, Bḍ tanayo.

¹¹ So Mt: eVā rāj-āsit. Vā, Bḍ rājarsiḥ.

¹² In lMt Girī[sam]vrajan; ceMt samiti-dhvajah.

¹³ Pañcāśao ca in fgMt; jMt reads this

half line, pañcāśat sapta ca tatna.

¹⁴ Tathā c-aiva in bMt; eVā omits th-āṣṭau ca.

¹⁵ So Mt, a¹-mVā, Bḍ. Bh, bkVṣ, CGr agree. CVā °śruvās; fBh °śruva; abGr °ścavās: gBh Śataśravas, tBh Vyutas°. Vṣ genly Śrutavān; aVṣ †Tukṣata.

¹⁶ So Mt, Ca¹Vā: a²-bdfghjklmVā, Bḍ sapta-ṣaṣṭi; but dVā repeats the line thus—

Śrutaśravāḥ ṣaṣṭi samās tatas tasya suto 'bhavat:

so bVā also, crp.

¹⁷ So Mt genly; bMt °ānvayo; dMt °āntayo; nMt tasya nayo. Vā, Bḍ tasya suto.

¹⁸ Bhavet in bkMt.

¹⁹ So Vā, Bḍ. Vṣ, Bh, CGr agree; gVṣ °tāyuta, abGr °tāmus, rBh °dhāyus; fBh 'dhutaś ca; jVṣ Uyus. Mt genly Apratāpi; a¹a²dfgmMt Apratāpi (which would be an easy misreading of Ayutāyī); nMt Anayā-pam; kMt Asutā.

²⁰ Ca in Mt.

²¹ So bkMt, Bḍ; Vā genly ṣaḍ-vimśam: mVā that or ṣaṭ-trimśam. Mt genly, a¹a²fgjnVā ṣaṭ-trimśat or °śam: but dfgMt, bdhVā ṣaḍ-trimśat or °śa, where the ḍ suggests the correct reading is ṣaḍ-vimśat, for v and tr are often confused.

²² So Vā, Bḍ. Mt samā (kMt abdam) rājyaṃ.

²³ So Mt: kMt °śati.

²⁴ So Vā, Bḍ: eVā omits these words.

²⁵ So Mt genly; bnMt tasmān Nir°; nMt Nirāmitro: but ceMt samā Mitro bhuktvā c-aiva; kMt Śarmamitro bhogān bhuktvā; dfgMt Nirāmitro (g, °titro) bhuktvā c-ēmām.

pañcāśatam samāḥ ṣaṭ ca ²⁶ Suksatraḥ ²⁷ prāptavān mahīm
 trayo-vimśad Brhatkarmā ²⁸ rājyaṁ varṣāny ²⁹ akārayat
 Senājit ³⁰ samprayātas ca ³¹ | Senājit ³⁰ sāmpratam ³² cāpi
 bhuktivā ³³ pañcāśatam ³⁴ mahīm | etā vai ³⁵ bhokṣyate ³⁶ samāḥ ³⁷
 Śrutañjayas ³⁸ tu ³⁹ varṣānī ⁴⁰ catvāriṁśad ⁴¹ bhaviṣyati
 mahā-balo ⁴² mahā-bāhur ⁴³ mahā-buddhi ⁴⁴ parākramah
 aṣṭa-vimśati ⁴⁵ varṣāni mahīm ⁴⁶ prāpsyati vai ⁴⁷ Vibhuḥ ⁴⁸
 aṣṭa-pañcāśatam ⁴⁹ cābdān ⁵⁰ rājye sthāsyati vai Śuciḥ ⁵¹
 aṣṭa-vimśat ⁵² samā rājā ⁵³ Kṣemo ⁵⁴ bhokṣyati vai mahīm ⁵⁵

Vṣ, eVā, Bh, Gr Nirāmitro. Bh adds *tat-sutaḥ*.

²⁶ But *fgMt śadva*; *nMt śadga*; *cMt śaṣṭaḥ*; *eMt hy aṣṭaḥ*; *eVā tasya*.

²⁷ So *dfMt, a³eVā, Bd*; Vṣ agrees: *kVā Suksatra*; *a³fgmVā⁰ksattā*. *Ca³a³Vā⁰krttaḥ*, *hVā⁰krttā*, *bVā⁰krtā*, *dVā⁰ksakrt*; *gMt Kṣuksatraḥ*; *bMt Suksaraḥ*. Mt genly *Surakṣaḥ*; *ceMt Sumitraḥ*; *kMt Nakṣatraḥ*; *nMt crp*. Bh, *bVṣ Sunakṣatra*; *abGr Suhakṣ⁰*; *CGr Svakṣetra*. Vṣ adds *tat-tanayah*.

²⁸ So Vā, Bd, with *śad, śam, or śa*. Mt *Brhatkarmā trayo-vimśad*; *ceMt tu dvā-trimśat*. Vṣ *Vṛhatkarman*. Bh *tsena*; *hBh Vihasena*. CGr *Bahukarmaka*; *abGr Varukarmaṇa*.

²⁹ So Vā, Bd; *eVā varṣāni⁰ kār⁰*. Mt genly *abdan rājyaṁ*, *fgMt abdan⁰*: *cenMt* read this half line, *prāptā (n, itas; c, twā) c-ēmām vasundharām*.

³⁰ So Mt, Vā genly, Bd: *a²bdjMt, a²a³Vā, Vṣ, CGr Sena⁰*; *nMt Sena⁰*, *mMt Śyena⁰*; *kVā San-jit*. Bh genly *Karmajit*, *nBh Kār⁰*, *hkBh Kūr⁰*; *rBh Dharmavid*: *eVā Maniṣi*. CGr inverts this king and the next. See the corresponding lines about *Adhisimākṣṇa* (p. 4, l. 6) and *Divākara* (p. 10, l. 5).

³¹ So Mt genly: *bfgmMt sāmpratāś c-āyam, jMt samprajic⁰*.

³² So Vā, Bd: *eVā sāmpratāś*.

³³ *Bhoktā* in *bdfgjnMt*.

³⁴ So *a²a³bdjMt*; *fgjMt śatā*. Mt genly *pañca-satam*.

³⁵ So Vā genly, Bd. *CVā etām vai*, 'this (earth)'. But *eVā pañcāśad*, thus bringing this version into similarity to the corresponding verses, p. 4, l. 6 and p. 10, l. 5.

³⁶ *CVā bhujyate*; *fmVā bhokṣyase*.

³⁷ In *mVā tara*; *fVā tave*.

³⁸ So all; except *jMt Śrutiñj⁰*; *a³kVā Śatañj⁰*; *gMt Śrūtañj⁰*; *bMt Stutañj⁰*; *dVṣ Kṣatañj⁰*; *bVṣ Ripuñj⁰*: *eVā Satamyajñas*. Bh names him *Śrtañjaya* indirectly, *Śrtañ-jayād Viprah*; *cBh Mutañj⁰*. CGr inverts him and Senājit.

³⁹ *Ca* in *cenMt*.

⁴⁰ In *enMt varṣānām*; *jMt varṣān vai*.

⁴¹ *Pañca-trimśad* in *fgMt, eVā*.

⁴² This line is only in Vā, Bd. *CVā bāhur*.

Bd *ripuñjayo*.

⁴³ *CVā buddhir*.

⁴⁴ *CVā bhīma*; *gVā bala*.

⁴⁵ So Mt; *eVā aṣṭa-vimśat tu*: *gmVā pañca-vimśat tu*. Vā, Bd *pañca-trimśat tu*.

⁴⁶ *Masvā* in *eVā*.

⁴⁷ So Mt genly; *jMt pāsyati⁰*; *cenMt samprāpsyate*. Vā, Bd *pālayitā*.

⁴⁸ So Mt genly, *eVā*; *bMt vibho*; *cefgMt Prabhuḥ*; *lMt prabho*: *djkMt vīryavān* for *vai Vibhuḥ*. Vṣ, Bh genly *Vipra*; *pBh Dhīpra*; *jVṣ Pipra*; *kVṣ Ripu*; *bVṣ Ripuñ-jaya*. CGr *Bhūri*; *abGr Samvi*. Vā, Bd *nṛpaḥ*, giving no name; *mVā [vr]nṛpaḥ*.

⁴⁹ *Aṣṭau pañcāśatā* in *eVā*.

⁵⁰ So *dfgMt, Vā, Bd*: *cMt cābdā*; *nMt, hVā cāṣṭān*; *eMt cāṣṭā*. Mt genly *ṣaṭ ca*: *eVā sūnho*.

⁵¹ So all: except *nBh Suci*; *bMt Muciḥ*; *eMt Śrucih*; *gBh Śusi*. Vṣ adds *tasna putrah*.

⁵² In *cdeMt aṣṭa-trimśat* (or *śa*); *mMt dvātrimśas ca*.

⁵³ So Mt. Vā, Bd *pūrnāḥ*.

⁵⁴ So all: except *eVā Kṣamo*; *lMt Kṣaimo*. Vṣ genly, CGr *Kṣenya*: *fgMt Pakso* or *Yakso*.

⁵⁵ So Mt genly; *cefgmMt bhokṣyati* (*f, bhoyati*) *medinīm*. Vā, Bd *rājā bhaviṣyati*.

Suvratas tu ⁵⁶ catuḥ-śaṣṭim ⁵⁷ rājyam prāpsyati vīryavān ⁵⁸	
pañca-trimśati ⁵⁹ varṣāni	pañca varṣāni pūrṇāni ⁶⁰
Sunetro ⁶¹ bhokṣyate mahīm ⁶²	Dharmanetro ⁶³ bhaviṣyati ²⁰
bhokṣyate ⁶⁴ Nirvṛtiś ⁶⁵ c-ēmām ⁶⁶	aṣṭa-pañcāśataṁ samāḥ ⁶⁷
aṣṭa-vimśat ⁶⁸ samā rājyam	aṣṭa-trimśat ⁶⁹ samā rājyam ⁷⁰
Trinetro ⁷¹ bhokṣyate tataḥ ⁷²	Suśramasya ⁷³ bhaviṣyati
catvārimśat tath-aṣṭau ca ⁷⁴ Dr̥ḍhaseno ⁷⁵ bhaviṣyati	trayas-trimśat tu varṣāni
trayas-trimśat tu ⁷⁶ varṣāni	Sumatiḥ ⁷⁹ prapsyate tataḥ ⁸⁰
Mahinetraḥ ⁷⁷ prakāśyate ⁷⁸	
dvā-trimśat tu ⁸¹ samā rājā ⁸² Sucalas ⁸³ tu bhaviṣyati ⁸⁴	²⁵

⁵⁶ So Bd. Vṣ, Bh, CGr agree: also eVā *Suvratas tha* (for *Suvrato 'tha*); CbfgmVā *Suvratas tu*. Vā genly *Bhuvatas tu*; jVā, 2 MSS of CVā *Yuvatas*; dVā *tsavatsara*; jBh *Suvṛta*; abGr *Sujāta*. Mt genly *Anuvratas*, gMt *'traś*; fMt *Anuvṛta*: ceMt *Kṣemakasya*.

⁵⁷ So Mt, Vā, Bd (°ti, °tī, °tīm, °tīm): cdeMt *sutah śaṣṭi*; dVā *tu śaṣṭim vai*; mMt *śaṣṭi samā*.

⁵⁸ In ceMt *yatnataḥ* (for *Suvrataḥ*? see note ⁵⁶).

⁵⁹ So CbMt; fgjkmMt *'trinśat tu* (m, ca; k omits tu). AlMt *'vimśati*; dMt *pañcāśac ca* (with a syll. short).

⁶⁰ So Vā, Bd: eVā *varṣāni* repeated.

⁶¹ In jMt *†Snānātro*; lMt *pañcāśan*.

⁶² Mahān in jMt.

⁶³ So Vā, Bd; also hVṣ, hkBh, and v.r. in GBh: hV *'nepro*. Bh genly *Dharmasūtra*; nBh *'putra*; bqBh *'kṣetra*. Vṣ, Gr briefly *Dharma*.

⁶⁴ Bhojyate in mMt, emVā.

⁶⁵ So Mt; jMt *Nirvṛtiś*; eVā *Nṛbhṛtaḥ*. Vā, Bd *nṛpatiś*.

⁶⁶ So Mt. Bd *c-ēmā*; a'a'a'fkmVā *caimā*; hVā *caibhā*; dVā *c-ōbhā*; other Vā *c-aiva*: eVā *prthvīm*.

⁶⁷ In fMt *aṣṭam p°*: bMt *aṣṭa-pañcāśa vai samām*.

⁶⁸ So Mt: cdeMt *'vimśa*.

⁶⁹ So Vā, Bd. CVā *aṣṭa°*.

⁷⁰ So Vā. Bd *rāṣṭrān*.

⁷¹ So Mt genly; jMt *Train°*: cdefgMt *Sun°*.

⁷² In cefgjMt *nṛpaḥ*; dMt *mahīm*.

⁷³ So Bd; Vṣ genly *Suśrama*: hVṣ *Suśrama*, eVṣ and abGr *Suś°*, CGr *†Smas°*:

dVṣ *Suśuma*; tBh *Śrama*. Bh genly *Śama*; hknPb *Sama*; bVṣ *Susava*; hVṣ *Suvrama*. Vā genly *Suvratasya*, eVā *Suśrut°*.

⁷⁴ So Mt; eVā *'śutam aṣṭau ca*. Vā, Bd *'śad †daś-aṣṭau ca*.

⁷⁵ So a'djMt, Vā genly, Bd. Vṣ genly, BortBh agree; CGr *'senaka*; jVṣ *'śnena*; abGr *Dathasenaka* (Pkt): mMt *Dr̥ḍhanetā*; fgMt and eVā *Vṛhatseno*; bMt *Mahats°*, nMt *Mahās°*, CVa'a'a'Mt *Dyumatś°*, and so GpBh (altered in p to *Dr̥ḍhas°*).

⁷⁶ So Mt genly; djMt *'śac ca*; fgMt *'śati*: kMt *pañca-trimśad* (omitting tu).

⁷⁷ So CVa'a'knMt: a'a'bdfgjMt *mahīm N°*.

⁷⁸ So Mt genly: a'b'fMt *praśāsyate*, dgMt *'ti*; a'kMt *praśāsyate*, gjnMt *'ti*. The root *praśās* appears to be treated as belonging to the *ya* class, see *Various local dynasties*, note ⁶⁴, post.

⁷⁹ So Vā, Bd, Vṣ, Bh, CGr: dVṣ *Sumanti*.

⁸⁰ In eVā *'te mahīm*; dVā *vimśatiḥ samāḥ*.

⁸¹ So Mt genly, eVā; dfgkMt *'śac ca*; nMt *'śatam*. Vā *dvā-vimśati*; jMt *'śat tu*. Bd *catvārimśat*.

⁸² So Mt; fgMt *rājan*. Vā, dMt *rājyam*. AkMt add *hy*.

⁸³ Mt genly *Acalas*; bMt *Abalas*: a'a'jIVā *Sucalo*; CVā *Sucālo*; a'a'bhhVā *Sucālo*. Vṣ, nMt, Bh, CGr *Subalas*; hBh *Subāla*; cBh *Surbola*: eVā *Sudhanvā*; rBh *Bhūvana* or *Bhūbala*; one CVā MS *Yuvāno*. *Sucalo* seems the best form. Bd omits this line: dVā reads it—

rājyam Sucālo bhokṣyati atha śatru-jayī tataḥ;

which suggests a king *Satrujayin*, but no other authority supports this. Bh adds *janitā tatc.h*, 'son of the preceding'

catvāriṃśat samā rājā ⁸⁶ Sunetro ⁸⁶ bhokṣyate ⁸⁷ tatah ⁸⁸
 Satyajit ⁸⁹ prthivīm rājā ⁹⁰ try-aśitim ⁹¹ bhokṣyate ⁹² samāh ⁹³
 prāpy-ēmām Viśvajit ⁹⁴ cāpi pañca-vimśad ⁹⁵ bhaviṣyati
 Ripuñjaya ⁹⁶ tu varṣāni ⁹⁷ pañcāsat prāpsyate mahīm
 soḍaśaite ⁹⁸ nṛpā jñeyā bhavitāro Brhadrathāh
 trayo ⁹⁹-vimś-ādhikam teṣām rājyaṃ ca śata-saptakam
 dvā-trimśac ¹ ca ² nṛpā hy ete ³ bhavitāro Brhadrathāh ⁴
 pūrṇam varṣa-sahasram ⁵ vai ⁶ teṣām rājyaṃ bhaviṣyati ⁷.

30

Pradyotas.

Text—AMt 272, 1-5; AVā 99, 309^v-314^a; Bḍ iii, 74, 122^b-127^a.

Corresp. passages—CVs iv, 24, 1-2; GBh xii, 1, 2-4.

The Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmanḍa give the whole dynasty. The Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata name all the kings.

All are complete, except thus: CkMt omit lines 9, 10; gMt ll. 5, 6; ḍMt

⁸⁴ So Mt. Vā bhokṣyate tatah; eVā bhojyate^o.

⁸⁵ As to this line, see p. 13: dfykMt rājyaṃ.

⁸⁶ So Mt, Vā, Bḍ. Vṣ genly, frtBh Sunēta, dVṣ °nāta; Bh genly, aVṣ °nūtha. CGr Nūta.

⁸⁷ In kMt bhojyate; eVā bhavitā.

⁸⁸ In dfykMt nṛpāh.

⁸⁹ So all (see p. 13); except jkMt Saptajit; cdemMt Sarvajit.

⁹⁰ So cdefkmMt, eVā; gjMt °vī-rājā. Vā genly °vī-rājyaṃ. Bḍ °vī-rāṣṭram.

⁹¹ So Vā, Bḍ: cefgkmMt aśitim; dMt aśitih: eVā trimśatam: jMt reads this half line, 'śitim prāpsyati vai samāh. Tryaśitim may be a mistake for hy aśitim, or (by metathesis of vowels) for trimśatam.

⁹² In eVā bhojyate; cdefgkmMt prāpsyate.

⁹³ In dfykMt tatah; ceMt nṛpāh.

⁹⁴ So all (see p. 13): but kVā Viśvajit; Vā genly Vīrajit: cdefgkmMt read this half line, Viśvajit c-aiva (d, sarba) varṣāni.

⁹⁵ So ekMt, dfmVā, Bḍ. Vā genly, cdjkmMt °trimśad: gMt tri-pañcāśad, fMt °cād.

⁹⁶ So Mt, eVā. Vṣ, Bh agree: see Pradyotas, note¹. Vā, Bḍ synonym. Ariñj^o; dVā + Acirañj^o; CGr Iṣuñj^o: gMt omits this line and repeats l. 24 here. Vṣ adds tasya putrah.

⁹⁷ So Mt, Vā. Bḍ varṣānām.

⁹⁸ So jMt (see p. 13) with soḍaśaite, which no doubt means soḍaśaite, because from Senājit to the end there were 16 kings, though its list is imperfect.

⁹⁹ So jMt (see p. 13) reading vayo, which is no doubt a misreading of trayo, tr and v being often confused. If we keep vayo, the line may perhaps mean, 'Their periods exceeded 20 years, and their kingdom lasted 700 years'; yet the first of these two statements, if it can be so rendered, seems inept: see p. 13.

¹ So Mt genly, Vā. CōlMt °śati (omitting ca). Bḍ dvāvimśac, which is the total number of kings mentioned. This half line in gVā is, etc mahābalāh sarve.

² Mat tu; eVā omits.

³ CMT nṛpārhyate (misprint): eVā etc hi nṛpā.

⁴ So Mt, Bḍ. Vā genly °thāt. CVā Drhadrathāh; eVā drḍha-vratāh.

⁵ In dMt pūrvam^o; fjMt pūrṇe varṣa-sahasre. Vṣ varṣa-sahasram ekam. Bh sāhasra-vatsaram.

⁶ Mt tu.

⁷ After this line AbcMt insert l. 3 from the next dynasty.

inserts l. 2 of the next dynasty after l. 8: *eVā* omits ll. 9 (second half), 10; *mVā* omits ll. 5, 6 and reads then ll. 8, 9, 7-10: *nBh* has lost *Viśākhayūpa* to the end; and *hpMt* and *btBh* the whole.

The total of the reigns agrees with the period assigned to the dynasty, which is 138 years according to *Vā*, *Bd*, *Vs*, and *Bh*. *Mt* generally says the duration was 52 years, or at most (if *dvi-pañcāsat* could mean *dviḥ pañcāsat*) 100 roundly; but several copies make it 152 years (see note ³⁹).

Brhadratheṣv ¹ atiteṣu ² Vīti-hotreṣv ³ Avantiṣu ⁴	Sunikah ⁷ svāminam hatvā
Pulikah ⁵ svāminam hatvā ⁶	putram samabhiṣekṣyati ⁹
sva ⁸ -putram abhiṣekṣyati	miṣatām kṣatriyānām hi ¹³
miṣatām ¹⁰ kṣatriyānām ¹¹ ca ¹²	Pradyota ¹⁶ Suniko ¹⁷ balāt ¹⁸
Bālakah ¹⁴ Pulik-odbhavaḥ ¹⁵	sa vai praṇata ¹⁹ -sāmanto ²⁰ bhaviṣyo ²¹ naya-varjitah ²²

¹ In *a¹bMt* *°rathe*: *nMt* *Bārhadratheṣv*, *eMt* *°ratheṣa*.

² In *bMt* *vyatiteṣu*; *a¹Mt* *°te tu*; *bVā* omits *°iteṣu*.

³ So *Mt* genly: *Vā* genly and *cdenMt* *Vīta^o*; *eVā* *Riti^o*. *Bd* *Virahantṣv*. *Vīti-hotreṣv* is right; see *Early Contemporary Dynasties*, l. 7, where all three read it right; the name occurs often in the *Purāṇas*.

⁴ So *Mt* genly. *Bd*, *a²a³bfgH* *Vā* *a-varitiṣu*. Other *Vā* *°hotreṣu* *vartitiṣu*, *eVā* *°varitiṣu*, *fjgkMt* *°bandhusu*; *lMt* *°bhaviṣyati*.

⁵ So *a¹-³bcdefgkmnMt*. *CGVā¹lMt* *Pulakah*; *jMt* *Palikāh*.

⁶ *Kṛtrā* in *eMt*.

⁷ So *fjnVā*; and *Vs* genly. *Bd*, *Bh* *Śunaka*; *dBh* *Śanaka*. *Vā* genly, *hkVs* *Munikaḥ*; *lVs* *Munika*. *Vs* says—

yo 'yam Ripuñjāyo nāma Bārhadratho 'ntyah tasya Suniko nām-āmātyo* bhaviṣyati. Sa c-ainam svāminam hatvā sva-putram Pradyota¹-nāmānam abhiṣekṣyati: where **kVs* *āpatyo*; **eVs* *Pradyotana*. *Bh* reads—

yo 'ntyo* Purañjāyo nāma bhaviṣyo

Bārhadrathah¹

tasy-āmātyas tu Śunako hatvā svāminam ātmajam

Pradyota-sañjñam rājānam kartā:—

where **lVs* *'nyah*; **dBh* *Ripuñjāyo* correctly, see p. 17, note ⁹⁵; **Bārhadrathah* for the metre; *eBh* *Bārhad^o*; *cpBh* *Vārhad^o*; *dBh* *'tha Bārhad^o*, *afnrsBh* *Bārhad^o*, in dis-

regard of metre: *qBh* and *v.r.* in *GBh* amend this half line, *bhāvyo Bārhadratho nṛpaḥ*.

⁸ *Swam* in *bcdMt*; *eMt* *†sūm*.

⁹ So *Vā*, *Bd*; *sam-* was probably *svam* originally: *dVā* *rājye 'bhi^o*.

¹⁰ So *Mt* genly: *bMt* *jīyatām*; *lMt* *niyatām*; *nMt* *niyantā*; *dMt* *†maṣilām*: see p. 17, note ⁷.

¹¹ In *dMt* *°yāyām*.

¹² *Tu* in *cdefgjnMt*.

¹³ *Ca* in *eVā*.

¹⁴ So *Mt* genly: *bMt* *bālakaiḥ*; *jMt* *Mālikah*; see note ¹⁷.

¹⁵ So *cejnMt*; see note ⁵. *ACMt* *Pulako^o*; *kMt* *Pulako* merely. But *bMt* *Puliko balāt*, *lMt* *Pulako^o*, *fjgmMt* *Pāluko^o*. The accus. seems to be required.

¹⁶ So *Vā* genly. *Vs*, *Bh* corroborate, see note ⁷. *Bd* *°tiim*; *eVā* *Suduoatm*. *Ca¹a²kVā* *Pradyoto*.

¹⁷ See note ⁷; *fVā* *Śunike*. *Vā* genly *Muniko*, *mVā* *°ke*. *Bd* *nṛpatim*.

¹⁸ To its statement in note ⁷ *hVs* adds *†kyi sañnati pārśva svayam eva rājā svayāmava bhāvino*.

¹⁹ In *eMt* *prajāta*; *kMt* *prajāntāḥ*.

²⁰ In *lMt* *śrīmanto*.

²¹ So *Mt* genly, *eVā*. *Vā* genly, *a¹a²bMt* *°ṣye*; *jMt* *bhavitā*.

²² So *Ca²a³cejklmMt*, *cflghjklmVā*; so *AVā* which prints it *'naya^o*. But *dMt* *nava-v^o*; *eVā* *na ca v^o*; *fMt* *na ca dhārmikah*, *GVā¹a²mMt* *°dharmataḥ*, *bMt* *°dharma-jit*:

PRADYOTĀS

19

trayo-vimśat samā rājā ²³ bhavitā ²⁴ sa nar-ottamah ²⁵	5
catur-vimśat samā rājā ²⁶ Pālako ²⁷ bhavitā tatah ²³	
Viśākhayūpo ²⁹ bhavitā nrpaḥ pañcāsatīm ³⁰ samāh	
eka-vimśat samā rājā ³¹	eka-vimśat ³² samā rājyam
Sūryakas ³³ tu bhaviṣyati	Ajakasya ³⁴ bhaviṣyati
bhaviṣyati ³⁵ samā ³⁶ vimśat ³⁷ tat-suto Nandivardhanah ³⁸	
dvi-pañcāsat tato ³⁹ bhuktivā ⁴⁰	aṣṭa-trimśac ⁴¹ -chatam ⁴² bhāvyaḥ ⁴³
pranaṣṭāḥ ⁴⁴ pañca te nrpāḥ.	Prādyotāḥ ⁴⁵ pañca te sutāḥ ⁴⁶ . 10

dVā mitra-varjitah; bVā merely varjitah. Bd reads this half line bhaviṣyena pravar-titah.

²³ In a²a⁴Vā rājya.

²⁴ In nMt bhaviṣyati.

²⁵ In bInMt manmath-āturaḥ.

²⁶ So Vā, Bd. Mt genly aṣṭa-vimśati var-ṣāni: bMt °vimśati tathā varṣā (with an extra syll.), see Appendix I, § i: kMt °vimśat tato yo (with a syll. short).

²⁷ So all, except hBh Pat°; dBh Yāt° (p and y confused); kVṣ Gopāl°; ceMt Bāl°; bnMt Tīl°: jMt Pāsako; lVṣ Baka; lMt Nalakṣo. Vṣ adds, tasyāpi Pālaka-nāmā putro; Bh yat Pālakah sutah.

²⁸ So Vā, Bd: eVā punah. Mt nrpāḥ.

²⁹ So genly, except dVṣ °yapa, bVṣ °yūgha, cBh °śūpa, bMt and aVṣ °bhūpo, fmVā °dhūpo, jBh °dūya, fgMt °rūpo, rLh °nrpa. With the dialectical variation of ṣ and kh, nMt and deVā Viśaṣa-yūpo, bhVā °sūyo, kBh °mūpa. Otherwise dMt Viśākhayūpo; hBh Viṣay°; kVṣ Viśāṣaṁy°. Bh adds tat-putro; Vṣ implies it.

³⁰ So Ca¹a²a⁴Vā; bghkVā °vī; a²IVā °vīḥ: Bd °tam. Mt reads this half line, tri-pañcāsat (jMt pañcāsa dvā) tathā samāḥ; eVā kṣatriyānām samā satam.

³¹ So Mt: kMt rājye.

³² So efVā, Bd: mVā first trayo-vimśat (part of l. 5?) but in repeating has eka°. Vā genly eka-trimśat.

³³ So Mt genly: lMt Sūryabas; dMt Mūr-jakas; mMt Mrjukas.

³⁴ So Vā, Bd; fVā Ajyak°, dVā Akark°. eVā reads this half line Ajakah sa karisyati. Bh genly Rājaka; Vṣ Janaka: dBh Cājaka; akVṣ Ajaka; hVṣ Aja.

³⁵ In bMt Śiśunākah.

³⁶ So Vā, Bd, bMt. Mt genly nrpas; fMt bhr̥śas.

³⁷ Mt trimśat; jMt tadvat.

³⁸ So Mt, Bd. Vṣ, Bh agree: dBh Nanda° altered to Nandī°; cVṣ Naksi°. Vā genly Varti°; one MS of CVā Vardhi°; a¹Vā Kīrti°. Bh adds tat-putrah; Vṣ implies it.

³⁹ So ACbklmMt: dMt chate; fjmMt cha-tam; ceMt satam.

⁴⁰ In cdefjjMt bhūtvā; lMt bhāvyaḥ.

⁴¹ So Vā genly, Bd; Ca¹Vā astā°; jVā affi-trimśat; dVā +aṣṭāṭsa.

⁴² In jmVā satam; dhVā tatam; gVā samā.

⁴³ In gVā rājā.

⁴⁴ In gMt prānaṣṭāḥ; bMt prānanyāḥ; fMt prānāṁdyāḥ; lMt prothotāḥ.

⁴⁵ So Vā genly, Bd: a¹a²a⁴kmVā, Vṣ Prad°. Bh Pradyotanāḥ; dBh Prād°.

⁴⁶ So Vā. Bd nrpāḥ. Similarly Vṣ—ity ete aṣṭa*-trimśad*-uttaram abda*-satam pañca Pradyotāḥ prthivīm bhok-syanti:

where *aVṣ sat, hVṣ dvā; +bhkVṣ vimśad; +jVṣ arddā, hVṣ aṣṭa, and kVṣ arū, all cor-ruptions of abda. Bh says—

pañca Pradyotanā ime

aṣṭa*-trimś*-ōttara-satam bhoksyanti

prthivīm nrpāḥ:

where *fmBh aṣṭā; +mBh vimś.

ŚISUNĀGAS

Śisunāgas.

Text—AMt 272, 6–13^a; AVā 99, 314^b–322^a; Bḍ iii, 74, 127^b–135^a.

Corresp. passages—CVṣ iv, 24, 3; GBh xii, 1, 5–8^a.

The Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa give the whole, and the Matsya all except lines 11, 12. The Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata name all the kings and state the duration of the dynasty. All copies of the Matsya erroneously introduce the first two Kānpāyana kings (see note ²⁴) after l. 7; and the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa put l. 8 before ll. 6 and 7 contrary to all the other authorities.

The defects are these. CMt omits l. 1; *ce*Mt ll. 13, 14; *j*Mt ll. 6 (second half), 7 (first half); *k*Mt ll. 2, 3, 10; *l*Mt ll. 5, 6; *a*⁴Vā omits ll. 6–end; *e*Vā ll. 8–10; *f*Vā ll. 15, 16, 17 (first half); *g*Vā ll. 7–14, 16, 17; *h*Vā has only ll. 1–3; *m*Bh omits Kṣemadharman to Udayin; *n*Bh has only the verses stating the duration of the dynasty; and *hp*Mt, *bt*Bh have nothing.

All the authorities say there were 10 kings, and do not differ much in their names. The duration of the dynasty appears to have been 163 years, for the Mt reading in l. 16 can well mean 'hundred, three, plus sixty' (see Introdn. §§ 42 ff.), though it would mean '360' if taken as literary Sanskrit; moreover '163' is a probable figure while '360' is an impossible one. The terms certainly admit of ambiguity, and an examination of the other versions shows how it developed.

The Bḍ and Bh reading *ṣaṣṭy-uttara-sata-trayaṃ* (see note ⁴⁰) can also mean 163, if it represents a Pkt original of (something like) *saṣṭhy-uttara-sataṃ tao*, but means 360 if taken as correct Skt. The former interpretation seems preferable, because this expression is used with *varṣāni* in Bḍ and with *samāh* in Bh, and these combinations do not constitute correct Skt but would be good in Pkt: still an ambiguity does appear there. It seems to have affected the two other versions. The Vā reading (see note ⁴⁶) taken as Pkt means 'hundred, three, plus sixty-two', but this is an impossible style of reckoning, and the only tenable construction is to read it as correct Skt meaning 362. As this is an impossible figure, I would suggest that the *dvi* is a corruption of *abda*¹, that the initial *a* blended with or was elided after the word that represented *varṣāni* in the Pkt original², and that the remaining *bda* was mistaken for *dvā* (or *dvi*). If this suggestion be tenable, the Vā reading agreed with Mt and meant 163. The Vṣ following upon the ambiguity and mistake says explicitly '362 years' in correct Skt.

¹ Compound consonants are sometimes inverted in the MSS, see note ⁴¹.

² Such elisions do take place in Pkt, and appear in Sanskrit, cf. p. 15, note ²⁰; p. 17, note ²¹; *Various local dynasties*, note ⁴⁸, *infra*; and to that cause are no doubt due the elisions in the middle of the following lines, AVā 88, 81, 115; 94, 21:—

apadhvaṃs-ēti bahuśo 'vadat krodha-samanvitaḥ.

devaiḥ sārḍham mahātejā 'nugrahāt tasya dhīmataḥ.

rathī rājā 'py anucaro 'nyo 'gāc c-aiva ānudyāte.

Instances might be easily multiplied from the Purāṇas.

ŚISUNĀGAS

21

Hatvā¹ teṣāṃ yaśaḥ kṛtsnam Śisunāgo² bhaviṣyati
 Vārāṇasyāṃ sutāṃ sthāpya³ | Vārāṇasyāṃ sutas tasya⁴
 śrayiṣyati⁵ Girivrajam | sa yāsyati⁶ Girivrajam⁷
 Śisunāgas ca⁸ varṣāṇi catvāriṃśad bhaviṣyati
 Kākavarṇaḥ⁹ sutas tasya¹⁰ ṣaṭ-triṃśat¹¹ prāpsyate mahīm¹²
 ṣaṭ-triṃśac cāiva¹³ varṣāṇi | tatas tu vimśatiṃ¹⁴ rājā
 Kṣemadharmā¹⁵ bhaviṣyati | Kṣemadharmā¹⁶ bhaviṣyati 5
 catvāriṃśat¹⁷ samā rājyaṃ¹⁸ Kṣatraujāḥ¹⁹ prāpsyate tataḥ²⁰
 aṣṭā-vimśati²¹ varṣāṇi²² Vimbisāro²³ bhaviṣyati²⁴
 Ajātaśatrur²⁵ bhavitā pañca²⁶-vimśat samā nṛpaḥ
 pañca²⁷-vimśat²⁸ samā rājā Darśakas²⁹ tu bhaviṣyati

¹ In a²Vā *hṛtvā*; kVā *hate*; cMt *kṛtvā*.

² So mMt, Bd. Vṣ, Bh agree: nMt *Śisunāgo* here. Mt, Vā genly *Śisunāko*; bMt *Śigru*^o; cMt *Suśruvāko* here; kVā *Śisuko*; kVṣ *Śisunāma*.

³ So Mt: jMt *sthāpyo*; dfMt *tu samsthāpya*.

⁴ So Vā and Bd.

⁵ So Mt genly; so bMt *ante*, see p. 18, but *śrayiṣyati* here: cenMt *vrajiṣyati*; dfgmMt *adhyāsyati*, jMt *'dhiṣṭhās*^o; lMt *ṭavyameti*.

⁶ So a²a²a²dVā, 3 MSS of CVā; bfgjlmVā so y^o: kVā *yo y^o*; kVā [so *yosya*] *yo y^o*. Bd *saṃy^o*: a¹Vā, 3 MSS of CVā *samprāpsyati*.

⁷ In kVā *oratam*.

⁸ So Bd. Vā *Śisunākasya* for *°nākaś ca*, as in fMt. Mt genly *Śisunākas tu*; egMt *Śisru*^o (*g, ca*); bMt *Śigru*^o.

⁹ So Mt, Bd. Vṣ, Bh agree; lMt *Kākevo*: kMt and fBh *Kākakarnaḥ*; mMt *Kāṣṇi-varmaḥ*. Vā *Śakavarṇaḥ*; fVā *Śavarṇa*.

¹⁰ Vṣ, Bh corroborate.

¹¹ So Vā, bdfgjMt, Bd: cMt *ṣaṭ-triṃśat*, which suggests *ṣaṭ-vimśat*, as in Mt genly: nMt *ṣaṭ-gimśat* (= *ṣaṭ-vimśat*).

¹² So Mt, eVā (which has only these two words). Vā, Bd *ca bhaviṣyati*.

¹³ So Mt genly (jMt *°c-āpi*): bceMt *°sati ca* (*b omits ca*); nMt *ṣaṭvimśati* (= *ṣaṭ-triṃśati*) *ca*.

¹⁴ So Vā and Bd.

¹⁵ So Mt genly. CMt *°dhomā*; nMt *°dhanvā*; dMt *°Kṣemadharmā*, where *ṣ* is dialectic variation in writing of *kh* which = *kṣ*: bMt *+Lemacarmā*.

¹⁶ So eVā, Bd. Vṣ, Bh agree. Vā genly

°varmā; bVā *°vama*; lVā *°vam*: *dehlpsBh °dharmā*, and yet say the next king was *Kṣetradharma-ja*; similarly fBh *Kṣemadhanvā* and *°dharma-ja*. Vṣ adds *tat-putraḥ*; Bh *tasya sulaḥ*.

¹⁷ So Vā, cenMt, Bd. Mt genly *caturvimśat*, dMt *°sati*.

¹⁸ So Vā, bMt. Bd *rāṣṭraṃ*; cMt *rājā*. Mt genly *so 'pi*.

¹⁹ So Vā genly, Bd. Vṣ genly agrees; bdfglVā *°trojāḥ*: eVā *Kṣetrojā*, mVā *°jah*, kVā *°yah*. Bh *Kṣetraja*; kBh *°trata*; qBh *Kṣetra*. Mt mostly *Kṣemajit*; gMt *°mavit*; fMt *°māmvit*; dMt *°mābiḥ*; kMt *°mārvi*; ceMt *°mārciḥ*; nMt *Hemajit*. Bh adds *Kṣemadharmā-ja*; Vṣ implies it.

²⁰ So Vā, Bd. Mt *mahīm*; nMt *mahi*.

²¹ So Mt. Vā *°sat* (bVā *°se*). Bd *aṣṭa-triṃśat*.

²² So Mt. Vā, Bd *samā rājā*, eVā *°nṛpaḥ*.

²³ There is great variation in this name: aVṣ *Vinvisāra*; jVṣ *Vimis*^o. Vṣ genly *Vidmis*^o. Bd, Bh, hVṣ *Vidhis*^o. Vā, kVṣ *Vivis*^o; bVṣ *Suvindus*^o; nMt *Vidusāno*: jMt *Vindumāno*, bfglMt *°duseno*: dMt *Bindunāso*. Mt genly *Vindhyaseno*, nMt *Vidh*^o: kMt *Kṣemadharmā*. Vṣ adds *tat-putro*.

²⁴ After this line Mt inserts the two lines about Kāṇvāyana and Bhūmimitra of the Kāṇvāyana dynasty (see *infra*), and repeats them in their proper place there. It is a clear error of misplacement.

²⁵ So all: nMt *Ajātās*^o; kVā *Ajas*^o. Bh adds *sutas tasya*.

²⁶ So Vā, Bd. Mt genly *sapta*; cegnMt *saptā*; bMt *aṣṭā*.

²⁷ So Vā, Bd. Mt *catur*.

Udayī³⁰ bhavitā tasmāt³¹ trayas-trimśat samā nrpāḥ
 sa vai pura-varaṁ rājā prthivyām Kusum-āhvayam³²
 Gaṅgāyā dakṣiṇe kūle³³ caturthe 'bde³⁴ kariṣyati
 catvārimśat³⁵ samā³⁶ bhāvyo rājā³⁷ vai Nandivardhanah³⁸
 catvārimśat trayas³⁹ c-aiva Mahānandī⁴⁰ bhaviṣyati
 ity ete bhavitāro⁴¹ vai⁴² Śaiśunāgā nrpā daśa⁴³
 śatāni⁴⁴ trīṇi varṣāṇi⁴⁵ ṣaṣṭi-varṣ-ādhikāni tu⁴⁶
 Śiśunāgā⁴⁷ bhaviṣyanti⁴⁸ rājānaḥ kṣatra-bandhavaḥ⁴⁹.

²⁸ Bḍ, a³Vā trimśat.

²⁹ Mt genly Vamśakas; eMt Vams°; cMt Vas°; nMt Vis°; jMt Vasyagas; kMt Śakas c-aiva (omitting tu). Vā Darśakas. Bḍ, Vṣ, Bh Darbhaka; fBh Dambl°. Darśaka seems the most central form.

³⁰ There is great variation in this name. Mt genly Udāsī; nMt Udātir; lMt ldam-bhī; dfMt Udāmbhī; gMt bhir; bMt Udābhir. Ca²Vā Udayī; a²a³IVā, Bḍ Udayī, bVā 'yayī: kVā Tradapī (an easy misreading); jMt Tedāmnī; mVā Uda. Vṣ genly Udayāśva, acfjgkVṣ 'yana, lVṣ 'ya: bVṣ Anaya (or Dan°); hVṣ Oaya. Bh Ajaya or Ajaya, (but see note³⁹). Udayī seems the best form.

³¹ In a¹⁻³Vā yasmāt; bMt tasyās; jMt bhūpās.

³² This line and the next only in Vā, Bḍ.

³³ In a²b¹Vā koṇe; kVā ko[va]ne.

³⁴ So Vā. Bḍ 'hni: eVā caturatpram (for catur-abdam?).

³⁵ So Mt, a²klVā, Bḍ. Vā genly dvā-catvārimśat, with a syll. too much (dvā cancelled in dVā): eVā dvi-c°.

³⁶ In eVā satir.

³⁷ Rājā wanting in eVā.

³⁸ So all: kVā Rand°; nMt Nandivardanaḥ. Bh gives him the patronymic Ajeya; qBh Ajñeya: see note³⁹.

³⁹ CVā trayam (which AVā adopts); jMt bhayam; nMt tataś.

⁴⁰ So Mt, Vā genly. Vṣ agrees: Bh °dih; b²jMt, kVā °dā; nMt Mahāmnandī; fVā Mahānandī. Bḍ Sahānandī. Bh °dds eulas tataḥ.

⁴¹ In eVā saṅkhyayā bhavitārā.

⁴² In a¹⁻⁴Mt 'tra.

⁴³ So Vā, except that it gives the name as Śaiśunākā; mVā Śaiṣu°; gVā Śaiśukās ca: see note⁴⁷. The correct number of kings is ten, as Vā, Bḍ, Vṣ, Bh say (see notes⁴⁶

and⁴⁸). Mt is confused. Its original reading was probably daśa vai Śiśunāka-jāḥ, but, since the first two Kānvāyana kings were erroneously inserted (see note²⁴), the number of names in it became 12, and attempts were made to reconcile the discrepancy: hence CGVcdfgmMt boldly read daśa dvau (fg, bdau) Śiśunāka-jāḥ, eMt daśādvā Śiśru°, kMt [daśa] dvādaśa Śiśu°; jMt crp [vai] daśa dve Śiśvanekataḥ: other copies evade inconsistency by an indefinite statement, thus a¹⁻⁴blnMt vanṣe vai (n, 'smīn) Śiśunākataḥ (j, °jāḥ; b, Śiśrunākataḥ); and eVā, which often agrees with Mt, Śiśunāg-ādayo nrpāḥ. For Bḍ, Vṣ, Bh, see note⁴⁶.

⁴⁴ In bVā etāni.

⁴⁵ In eVā varṣānāḥ (for °nām). Mt genly pūrnāni; dMt pūrbāni: fMt omits this word.

⁴⁶ So Mt; cenMt ca for tu: bMt ṣaṣṭir vā adhikāni ca; jMt ṣaṣṭi varṣāni kani ca. Vā genly dvi-ṣaṣṭy-abhyadhikāni tu; a¹⁻³b²dmVā dvā°; lVā dvā-ṣaṣṭy-ābh°; eVā dvi-ṣaṣṭyaś c-ādhik°. Bḍ condenses this and the preceding line into one—

bhaviṣyanti ca varṣāni ṣaṣṭy-uttara-śata-trayam.

Bh agrees, condensing the same two lines and the next into two lines—

Śiśunāgā * daś-aiv-aite ṣaṣṭy-uttara-śata-trayam¹

samā bhokṣyanti prthivīm, Kuru-śreṣṭha, Kalau nrpāḥ;

where * adrsBh Śaiś°; 'hBh trayah. Vṣ agrees with Vā—

ity ete Śaiśunāgā daśa bhūmi-pālās trīṇi varṣa-śatāni dvi¹-ṣaṣṭy-adhikāni bhaviṣyanti;

where 'CVṣ Śaiśu°; 'hVṣ crp °trīṇi varṣa-sahasrāni śatāni dve. See discussion, p. 20.

⁴⁷ So Bḍ, eVā. Mt genly Śiśunākā; eMt

Early Contemporary Dynasties.

Text—AMt 272, 13^b–17 ; AVā 99, 322^b–325 ; Bđ iii, 74, 135^b–138.

Corresp. passages—Vṣ and Bh, nil.

The Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmanḍa give the whole of this passage, except that the latter two have not got l. 8 and remove l. 2 to l. 8 : *j*Mt omits ll. 1, 5, 6 ; *a*²Vā ll. 2, 6, 7 ; *m*Vā ll. 6–8 (first half) ; and *h*_pMt and *a*⁴*h*Vā have nothing. Here *e*Vā gives ll. 1, 3, 4, 6 only, but long afterwards, out of place, namely after the first line about Viśvasphāṇi, inserts ll. 6, 7, 5, and 2 in modified form.

Etaiḥ sārḍham means contemporary with the Bārhadrathas and their successors, the Pradyotas and Śiśunāgas, for none of these are mentioned here, but the Aikṣvākus and the Kurus (who are probably the Pauravas) are included, whose dynasties have been fully set out *ante*. The next king Mahāpadma Nanda is called 'destroyer of all the kṣatriyas', and 'monarch of the whole earth which was under his sole sway'—which terms imply that he overthrew all the kingdoms mentioned in this list, so that all subsequent dynasties except the Kāṇvāyanas were śūdras (see *Nandas*, ll. 2–6). This list of contemporary dynasties means therefore all the old kṣatriya dynasties, which reigned from the time of the great battle till they and the Śiśunāgas in Magadha were swept away by the Nandas, whose dynasty follows this list.

Etaiḥ¹ sārḍham bhaviṣyanti tāvat²-kālam³ nṛpāḥ pare⁴
tulya-kālam bhaviṣyanti sarve hy ete⁵ mahikṣitāḥ

Aikṣvākavaś catur-vimśat⁶ Pañcālāḥ⁷ sapta⁸-vimśatiḥ
Kāśeyās⁹ tu catur-vimśad¹⁰ aṣṭa-vimśatir¹¹ Haihayāl.¹²

Śiśru¹³. Vā, kMt Śaiśu¹⁴ ; cMt Śaiśu¹⁵ : bMt Śiśunākād.

¹³ So Mt, Vā. Bđ *duś-aiv-aite*.

¹⁴ So Mt, Bđ ; *f*Vā *°vāḥ*. Vā, *d*Mt *°bāndhavāḥ* ; *f*Mt *vandhanāḥ* ; *b*Mt *°vīcavaḥ* with marg. note *°bandhavah*. *C*Vā confuses this with the first line of the following dynasties, reading—

Śaiśunākā bhaviṣyanti Tāvat-kālam nṛpāḥ
pare
rājānaḥ kṣatra-bāndhavāḥ etaiḥ sārḍham
bhaviṣyati :

and so *j*Mt which has the first line only, reading *yāvat-k¹⁶*. Hence perhaps the words *rājānaḥ kṣatra-bāndhavāḥ* should be read with the following list.

¹⁵ See above, note ¹⁴ : *k*Vā *etc.*

¹⁶ So Vā, Bđ. Mt *yāvat* ; *b*Mt *yāna* (with marg. note *yāvat*).

³ So Vā, Bđ, *f*_pMt : *d*Mt *kālī* ; Mt genly *Kalī* ; *e*Mt *kila* ; *b*Mt *eka* (with marg. note *Kalī*).

⁴ *Ca te* in *g*Vā. For this half line *k*Vā have *rājānaḥ kṣatra-bāndhavāḥ* (see above, note ¹³), and *k*Vā then adds as in the text.

⁵ So Mt. Vā, Bđ *sarva eva*.

⁶ So *b*_f*g*_mVā, Bđ. Vā genly *Aikṣvākavaś* (*d*Vā *°vaś*) ; *e*Vā *Iṣvākavaś*. Mt genly *catur-vimśat* (*ce*Mt *°vimśas*, *bj*Mt *°vimśa*) *tath=Aikṣvākāḥ* ; *bcd**f*_p*j*Mt *°Ekṣvākāḥ* ; *j*Mt *°mah-Ekṣvākāḥ* ; and so *n*Mt *crp*. This number does not agree with the Aikṣvāku list, see p. 9.

⁷ So *bcd**f*_p*j*_nMt, *a*¹⁷*°bdf*_p*g*_mVā, Bđ : other Mt and Vā *Pāñc¹⁸*.

⁸ So Mt. Vā, Bđ *pañca* (perhaps by influence of *Pañcālāḥ*).

⁹ So Mt genly : *cek*Mt *Kāśeyās* ; *l*Mt, *e*Vā *Kāśayās* ; *b*Mt *Kāśasās* ; *dj*Mt *Kāleyās*. Vā genly, Bđ *Kālakās*. See Appendix II, § ii.

Kalīṅgās¹³ cāiva dvā-trimśad¹⁴ Āsmakāḥ pañca-vimśatiḥ¹⁵
 Kuravaś cāpi ṣaṭ-trimśad¹⁶ aṣṭa-vimśati¹⁷ Maithilāḥ
 Sūrasenās¹⁸ trayo-vimśad¹⁹ Vītihoṭrās²⁰ ca vimśatiḥ²¹
 ete sarve bhaviṣyanti eka-kālam²² mahikṣitaḥ.

Nandas. —

Text—AMt 272, 18-22; AVā 99, 326-330; Bḍ iii, 74, 139-143.

Corresp. passages—CVṣ iv, 24, 4-7; GBh xii, 1, 8^b-12.

The Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa give the whole and have a common version in the main. Here for the first time the Bhāgavata gives the tradition in śloka, which agree in their purport with those three Purāṇas, and are not a mere list of names. Both versions are placed here, side by side, as they are independent and valuable. The Viṣṇu in prose agrees closely with the Bhāgavata.

All the versions are complete, except that a²/Mt omit ll. 6-10; mMt l. 9 with a space; bVā ll. 7-9 (first half); kVā ll. 2 (second half), 3, 7, 8; hpMt, a¹/kVā, and b/Bh have lost the whole; and lVṣ the matter of the last three Bh verses: eVā omits the whole here, but long afterwards, out of place, inserts it after the first line about Viśvasphāṇi.

The time assigned to Mahāpadma may mean the entire length of his life, as Mt seems to imply; and if so, the whole dynasty may have lasted about a hundred years as stated.

¹⁰ In jMt °śā; ceMt °śa: fMt blends this and the next number into one, thus *catur-vimśat tu*, and so *kMt ṣaṭ-trimśat tu*.

¹¹ So *GVā* a²/a¹nMt, violating the metre. Others save it thus, bMt °śati; CgMt, eVā °śat tu; a¹mMt °śās tu; jMt °śā tu; cdeMt °śas tu: lMt °śāti. Vā *catur-vimśat tu*; gVā, Bḍ °śas tu, where the number seems to be a mere repetition of the preceding number.

¹² In jMt *Hehayaḥ*; eVā *Tehayaḥ*.

¹³ So Mt genly, Vā: *fgMt Kāl°*; lMt *Kalīṅdās*; eMt *Kaliḥśās*. Bḍ + *Ekaliṅgās*.

¹⁴ So Mt genly. Vā reads this half line *dvā-trimśad vai Kalīṅgās tu*; Bḍ *dvā-trimśad Eka°*. But *cenMt °dvā-vimśa-d*; lMt °*catvārimśat* (with a syll. extra); bMt °*catvārid*: eVā reads this line—

Āsmakāḥ pañca-vimśac ca ṣaṭ-vimśac ca Kalīṅgākāḥ.

¹⁵ So Mt; bMt *Āsmakāḥ*. Vā, Bḍ *pañca-vimśat tath-Āśakāḥ*, prob. Pkt for *tath-Āsmakāḥ*: mVā *crp*: for eVā see note ¹⁴.

¹⁶ So Mt, Vā genly, Bḍ; nMt *ṣaṭ-vimśad* (= *ṣaṭ-trimśad*); kVā merely *trimśad*. CbVā, bMt *ṣaṭ-vimśad*: eVā *pañcāśad* here, but afterwards (see p. 23) indefinitely *ūnavimśat tathā c-ābhūd*. These numbers do not agree with the Paurava list, see p. 4.

¹⁷ So *fgMt*, Vā, Bḍ. Mt genly °śās tu; dnMt °śat tu; bMt °śa tu: eVā *varṣāṇy aṣṭādaś-aiva tu* here, but afterwards (see p. 23) agrees with the text.

¹⁸ In bMt, dVā *Sūras°*; nMt *Suras°*.

¹⁹ In ceMt, eVā °śa; jMt °śā.

²⁰ In ceMt *Vīta°*; eVā *Rūtihoṭrās*.

²¹ In eVā °tim.

²² In jMt *Kali-kāle*. See p. 23.

Mt, Vā, and Bđ.

Mahānandi¹-sutaś cāpi
 sūdrāyām³ Kalik-āmsa-jah⁴
 utpatsyate Mahāpadmah
 sarva-kṣatr-āntako⁹ nṛpah
 tatah prabhr̥ti rājāno
 bhaviṣyāh sūdra-yonayah
 eka¹²-rāt sa¹³ Mahāpadma
 eka-cchattro¹⁵ bhaviṣyati
 aṣṭāṣīti¹⁷ tu varṣāni¹⁸
 prthivyām ca bhaviṣyati¹⁹
 sarva-kṣatram²⁰ ath-ōddhṛtya²¹
 bhāvin-ārthena coditah²³
 Sukalp-ādi²⁴-sutā²⁵ hy aṣṭau²⁶

¹ In fgnMt °dī; kBh °da.² This vocat. expletive has no doubt ousted some genuine word, which may have been *lubdhah*, because Vṣ genly describes him as *ati-lubdha*; kVṣ *lubdha*; cVṣ *bhilubdha*; dJlVṣ *ati-buddha*; kVṣ *crp*.³ In Bđ, jMt °yāh; bVā sūdrā vā.
⁴ So Mt genly; dMt °āmsu-jah; cenMt °āmsatah; bkMt °āmsakah; fMt °ām-jayah; jMt *kālikā...jah*. Vā, Bđ *kāla-samvrtah*; eVā °samvrtah; bVā *kāla-[pañ]samvrtah*.⁵ So ahrsBh, Vṣ. Bh genly sūdrī.⁶ In jVṣ [bha...rno] garbh-ōd°; dVṣ *jar-mod°*.⁷ In fBh °rdhalī apptly; cf. *Andhras*, note 2. Vṣ has no corresponding word.⁸ Vṣ *Mahāpadmo Nandah*: lVṣ °patma always.⁹ So Mt. Vā °āntare, altered in dVā to °āntako. Bđ, eVā °ānta-kṛn.¹⁰ Vṣ *akhila-kṣatr-ānta-kārī*.¹¹ Tv omitted in adrBh. Vṣ sūdrā bhūmi-pālāh.¹² In kVā saka.¹³ In cekMt rājā; mMt *padma*; fMt *ehya*; lVā *su* for *sa*.¹⁴ In dBh °cchattrā-; jkBh °kṣatrām; fBh *eka-cchattrām sa*.¹⁵ In lMt °kṣatro; bMt °mātro: jMt *ekas chatro*; kVā *ṭekatro*.¹⁶ Vṣ has the same expressions; kVṣ *c-aika-chātrā-samullaṅgh-ānamita-sāsano*.

Bh (with Vṣ).

Mahānandi¹-suto rājan²
 sūdrā⁵-garbh-ōdbhavo⁶ bali⁷
 Mahāpadma-patih⁸ kaścin
 Nandah kṣatra-vināśa-kṛt⁹
 tato nṛpā bhaviṣyanti
 sūdra-prāyās tv¹¹ adhārmikāh
 sa eka-cchattrām¹⁴ prthivīm
 an-ullaṅghita-sāsana¹⁶
 sāsiṣyati Mahāpadmo
 dvitīya iva Bhārgava²²
 tasya c-aṣṭau²⁷ bhaviṣyanti

¹⁷ So all genly: *AjklmMt °tis*; eMt, dVā °tiñ; jVā *aṣṭāṣīti*. *CeklVā aṣṭā-vimśati* (omitting *tu*), which AVā adopts.¹⁸ In cdfjgnMt *sa v°*; eMt *saṁv°*; bMt *sahasrāni*.¹⁹ So Mt genly; bcrjgnMt *tu bh°*; dMt *sa bh°*: fgnMt *prthivī śobhayiṣyati*. Vā, Bđ *prthivīm pālayiṣyati*.²⁰ In Ca'a'gklVā *kṣatra*; a'Vā *kṣetra*.²¹ In CGVā³ Mt *ath-ōtsādya*, lMt *tath-ōt°*: ceMt *ath-ōtpātya*, a'a'bMt *tath-ōt°*. Bđ *samuddhṛtya*. Ca'a'gklVā *hrtoddhṛtya* or *hrtodvṛtya* or corruptions of these; other Vā *haroddhṛtya*; eVā *athcvṛtya*; dVā *tato hatvā*. The correct reading may be *ath-ōtsādya*, or °ōtpātya or °ōddhṛtya.²² Vṣ *Paraśu-Rāma iv-āparaḥ*.²³ So Mt genly (cknMt °noditah): bMt *bhavit-ārth°*; jMt *bhavitorth°*. Vā genly, Bđ *bhāvino rīhasya vai balāt*; lVā °thasya *mahābalāt* (with a syll. extra); kVā °thamāhābalāt; a'Vā °thān mahābalān: eVā *Viśvanāthasya vai balāt*. Vā, Bđ have the same expression in AVā 88, 80, 95; 101, 60; Bđ iii, 63, 79, 94; iv, 2, 59.²⁴ So Mt mostly: fgnMt *Sukulp°* or *Sukuly°*; kMt *Sulul°*; bknMt *Sumāly°*; ceMt *Kuśal°*; eVā *Sahaly-ādyāḥ*; jMt +*Satulyā vai*: a'Vā *saṁhasrāt sa*, fVā °svātstat, mVā °svāt (one syll. short); dVā *saṁhāsvās tat*: 3 MSS of CVā *saṁhasrāt tat*, 3 MSS of CVā and a'a'Vā °svās tat (which AVā adopts): gVā *haṁsa-*

MAURYAS

Mt, Vā, and Bđ.

samā dvādaśa te nṛpāḥ²⁸
 Mahāpadmasya paryāye³⁰
 bhaviṣyanti nṛpāḥ kramāt³²
 uddharisyati tān sarvān
 Kauṭilyo vai dvir aṣṭabhiḥ³⁵
 bhuktvā³⁷ mahīm³⁸ varṣa-śatam
 tāte⁴¹ Mauryān gamisyati⁴⁹

Bh (with Vṣ).

Sumālya-pramukhāḥ²⁹ sutāḥ
 ya imām bhokṣyanti mahīm³¹
 rājānaḥ sma³³ śatam³⁴ samāḥ
 nava Nandān dvijaḥ kaścit
 prapannān uddharisyati³⁶
 teṣām abhāve³⁹ jagatīm⁴⁰
 Mauryābhokṣyanti⁴³ vai Kalau. 10

Mauryas.

Text—AMt 272, 23–26 ; AVā 99, 331–336 ; Bđ iii, 74, 144–149.

Corresp. passages—CVṣ iv, 24, 7–8 ; GBh xii, 1, 13–16^a.

This dynasty is given by all five Purāṇas, but the account of it has suffered more than that of any other dynasty¹. Three versions exist here, the earliest in the

svās tat. Bđ tat-paścāt tat.

²⁸ In *bfgMt* sutā ; *eVā* satā.

²⁹ *Hy* omitted in *jMt* ; *bMt* †*svamityai*, corrected in margin to *hy aṣṭau* ; *gVā* *hy* etc.

²⁷ In *dBh* *tataś c°* ; *cBh* *yasya c°* ; *qBh* *tasya tvāṣṭau*, *oBh* *tasyāvā°*. *Vṣ* *tasy-dpy aṣṭau sutāḥ*.

²⁸ In *jMt* *vai nṛpāḥ* ; *kMt* *saṁsmṛtāḥ*.

²⁹ In *hklVṣ* *Sumāly-ādyāḥ* ; *abVṣ* *Sumāl-ā°* ; *Vṣ* genly *Sumāty-ā°* ; *fgVṣ* *Sumaty-ā°*.

³⁰ In *gMt*, *fmVā* °*yāyo* : *dVā* *payāye* altered to *dāyādā* ; *eVā* *bhāryāyām*.

³¹ In *dBh* *prthivīm* ; *fBh* *ye bhokṣyanti mahīm etām* : v.r. in *GBh* *mahīm bhokṣyanti ya imām*.

³² In *kMt* *nṛp-śtamāḥ*.

³³ *Ca* in *arsBh*.

³⁴ In *kBh* *taśam*. *Vṣ* agrees—

Mahāpadmaḥ tat-putrāś ca ekam varṣa-śatam avanī-patayo bhaviṣyanti.

³⁵ So *Vā* genly : *jVā* *dvir aṣṭatīḥ* ; *eVā* *dvi-ṣaṣṭibhiḥ* ; *aVā* *mahābalaḥ*. *Bđ* agrees, but ends *dvija-rṣabhaḥ*, which may be the true reading (see *Bh* reading). *Mt* reads differently—

uddharisyati Kauṭilyaḥ samair dvādaśa-bhiḥ sutān :

where *bMt* ends *sutāḥ* ; *cnMt* *sa tān* ; *fMt* *sa tā* ; *gMt* *śaiam* ; *jMt* *saṁāt* ; *kMt* *kramāt*. For *dvādaśabhiḥ* read perhaps *dvija-rṣabhaḥ*. After this line *bfglnMt* insert the first line of the next dynasty.

³⁰ In *lBh* *papannān uharisyati*. *Vṣ* says—*nav-aiva* tān Nandān Kauṭilyo brāh-ṁaṇaḥ samuddharisyati* :

where **hVṣ* *nava vai*, *jVṣ* *navai*, *kVṣ* *nav-aitā*, *aVṣ* *tāh-aiva* ; **hVṣ* *tān pyasokah*, *kVṣ* *Nandavala* ; **jkVṣ* *Koṭilyo*.

³⁷ In *fmVā* *bhuktā*.

³⁸ In *nMt*, *kVā* *mahā*. *Bhuktā mahī* would be better.

³⁹ In *fBh* *abhāvāj*.

⁴⁰ In *dBh* *prthivīm*.

⁴¹ In *eVā* *Nandair*.

⁴² So *CGVā* *Mt*, *eVā*, *mahī* being understood : *fMt* °*Mauryam* ; *cMt* °*gaur yām* ; *eMt* °*gaur yām* ; *bgMt* °*mokṣam* ; *lMt* °*ekah* ; *aVā* *kMt* °*mokṣo bhaviṣyati* ; *jMt* boldly paraphrases it, *prāpsyanti paramām gatim*. *Vā* differently ; mostly *Nand-ēndrah sa bhaviṣyati* (*dVā*, *sambhav*) : one MS of *CVā* *Nandendrah*°, and so *dVā* but altered to *nandanaḥ* ; *aVā* *Nandendrah*° ; *aVā* *Nandr-ēndrah*°, so *mVā* *crp* ; *bVā* *Nandethā* ; *kVā* *crp*. The true reading is prob. *Nand-ēndrah*, of which all the others are easy misreadings. *Bđ* *narendrah*°.

⁴³ Similarly *Vṣ*—*teṣām abhāve Mauryās* ca prthivim bhokṣyanti* : where **kVṣ* *So[da]-ryāḥ*.

¹ Because its great fame in Buddhism disgraced it in brahmanical eyes?

Matsya, the second in *eVāyu*, and the third in the *Vāyu* generally and the *Brahmāṇḍa*. They agree in general purport but have many differences. The second forms a stage of recension intermediate between the first and the third, and is the only copy that has preserved the names of all the kings. The Matsya version in all copies is incomplete and has one of its verses (v. 23) misplaced; thus, only 5 MSS mention Candragupta, the second king is always omitted, and the account generally begins with that verse 23, putting the last two kings first, and then mentions only four kings, *Asoka* and his three successors. All three versions are important, but cannot be reconciled merely by criticism; and, as they cannot all be exhibited side by side, the Matsya version is given first, and the two other versions are printed side by side; but in the Matsya version verse 23 has been removed to its proper place after verses 24 and 25.

The *Viṣṇu* and *Bhāgavata* mention the kings in the same order as the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa* with some differences in names, but the latter omits *Daśaratha*, and *bBh* want the whole.

In the Matsya version, *jMt* omits lines 4, 5, 8, 9; *lMt* l. 8, and inserts l. 9 after l. 12 of the following *Suṅga* dynasty; *hpMt* want the whole. In the *Vāyu* version, *aVā* omits ll. 1-3; *kVā* ll. 12, 13; *gVā* has only ll. 1-5; *hVā* wants the whole. In *eVā* the account is omitted at first, and inserted long afterwards, out of place, after the first line about *Viśvasphāṇi*.

The versions vary in the number of the kings. *Mt* says 10, but names only 7; *eVā* says 9 but gives 12; *Vā* and *Bd* say 9 and mention 9. *Vs* says 10 and names 10. *Bh* says 10 but gives only 9. The best attested number is 10, and the omissions can be particularized: but *eVā* combines the *Mt* and *Vā* versions and has probably duplicated two kings in the middle.

All agree that the dynasty lasted 137 years. The regnal periods added together (excluding the *Mt* list which is incomplete) are 160 years in *eVā*, and (*Śāliśūka* being omitted) 133 in *Vā* and *Bd*; or, if we add *Śāliśūka*'s reign to the latter, the total is 146 years; and the total in *eVā* would be reduced to about 145 years if we correct its duplication in the middle. This figure, 145 or 146, is compatible with the stated duration, 137 years, if (as is probable) the total of the several reigns is nominally raised above the true total by reckoning fractions of years as whole years.

Matsya.

Kautilyaś Candraguptaṁ tu tato rājye¹ bhiṣekṣyati¹
 ṣaṭ-trimśat tu samā rājā² bhavit³ *Asoka*³ eva ca
 saptānām⁴ daśa varṣāṇi tasya naptā bhaviṣyati (24)

¹ This line is found only in *bfglnMt* where it is misplaced (see p. 26, note²⁰); *bMt* *Koṭiśaś Candraguptaś*²; *nMt* *Kautilyaś Candraguptasya tato rāṣṭre*²; and *lMt* ends *rāṣṭre niveṣya*.

² But *cnMt* *śamā rājā tu (n, ṣaṭ-trimśat = ṣaṭ-trimśat)*; *bMt* *ṣaṭ-trimśati samān rājā*.

³ So *dfgknMt*; *jMt* *Asoka*: *Mt* genly

Asoka; *ceMt* *Asoka*; *lMt* *Asoka v-eva ca*. Instead of the double expletive the true reading might be *Asokavardhana* as in *Vs*, *Bh*.

⁴ So *Mt* genly; *dMt* *saptāno* (or *nām*); *lMt* *saptānām*. Can the true reading be *Suyasā*, who is named by *Vs* and *Bh*? Cf. *daśanāḥ sapta* in *eVā* version, l. 7.

rājā Daśaratho⁵ 'ṣṭau⁶ tu tasya putro bhaviṣyati⁷
 bhavitā nava varṣāni tasya putras ca⁸ Sampratiḥ⁹ (25)
 bhavitā Śatadhanvā¹⁰ ca¹¹ tasya putras¹² tu ṣaṭ samāḥ¹³
 Bhadrathas tu¹⁴ varṣāni tasya putras ca¹⁵ saptatiḥ¹⁶ (23)
 ity ete daśa¹⁷ Mauryās tu ye bhokṣyanti¹⁸ vasundharām
 sapta-trimśac-chatam¹⁹ pūrnam tebhyah Śuṅgān²⁰ gamiṣyati²¹ (26)

eVāyu.

Candraguptam nṛpaṁ rājye
 Kauṭilyah sthāpayiṣyati
 catur-vimśat samā rājā
 Candragupto bhaviṣyati
 bhavitā Nandasāras²³ tu
 pañca-vimśat samā nṛpah
 ṣaṭ-trimśat tu samā rājā
 bhavit²⁴ Āśoka eva ca
 tasya putrah Kulālas²⁵ tu
 varṣāny aṣṭau bhaviṣyati

Vā genly and Bḍ.

Candraguptam nṛpaṁ rājye
 Kauṭilyah sthāpayiṣyati²²
 catur-vimśat samā rājā
 Candragupto bhaviṣyati
 bhavitā Bhadrāsāras²⁴ tu
 pañca-vimśat samā nṛpah
 ṣaṭ-trimśat²⁵ tu²⁶ samā rājā²⁷
Āśoko bhavitā nṛṣu²⁸
 tasya putrah Kunālas³⁰ tu
 varṣāny aṣṭau bhaviṣyati

⁵ In cMt °rath-āṣṭau: see note ³⁵.

⁶ Jyau in bMt; dMt au.

⁷ In a³kMt bhaviṣyanti ca tat-sulāḥ.

⁸ Tu in bfgnMt.

⁹ Mt genly tsaptatiḥ; dnMt °ti. Emended to Sampratiḥ as in eVā; see note ³⁰.

¹⁰ In nMt Ṣaḍadh°; mMt Sudh°.

¹¹ Tu in bdefgjnMt.

¹² Putras in a¹a³bdMt.

¹³ In fgMt tat-samāḥ; lMt ṣaṣṭhamāḥ; mMt padmapah.

¹⁴ In dMt °rathasya.

¹⁵ In dejnMt tu; bfMt putrasya.

¹⁶ So Mt genly, probably a misreading of sapta vai in Pkt form; see Vā, Bḍ, and Introdn. § 41: eMt vimśatiḥ.

¹⁷ So all MSS, though they name only 6, or 7 at most.

¹⁸ In bMt bhokṣyanti ca as in Vā, Bḍ.

¹⁹ In cenMt sapta-vimśa-satam.

²⁰ In dMt Suṅgān; ceMt Suṅgām; kMt svargam; bMt svargi; lMt sarva.

²¹ Vasundharā being understood: see p. 26, note ⁴²; Suṅgas, note ⁵³.

²² Vṣ says—Kauṭilya eva Candraguptam rāṇe 'bhikṣyati; where kVṣ has Kauṇḍilya.

Bh says—

sa eva Candraguptam vai dvijo rājye 'bhikṣyati.

²³ So eVā, instead of Vindusāras.

²⁴ So Vā genly, Bḍ. Vṣ rightly Vindusāra. Bh Vāris°; gBh Vāris°; emBh Vārikāra. Both add, 'son of Candragupta'; Vṣ tasya²⁵ api putro, Bh tat-suto.

²⁵ Ṣaḍ-vimśat in Ca²a⁴Vā only, which AVā adopts.

²⁶ In gVā ca; fmVā sa.

²⁷ In fmVā mahā-rājā.

²⁸ So Vā. Vṣ, Bh call him Āśokavardhana; jVṣ Āśoka°; fBh Aloka°; kVṣ Ayośoka°: see Appendix II, § 1. Bḍ Āśokānām ca trpti-dah, perhaps a play on the name.

²⁹ An easy misreading of Kunālas.

³⁰ So OVā here and in next line. But a¹-bdfgklmVā, Bḍ Kuśālas, jVā Kaśālas, which all have Kuśāla- in next line, except bVā Nuśāla- and lost in gVā. Vṣ, Bh call Āśoka's successor Suṣāśas; chVṣ Svay°; gVṣ Stuy°; bVṣ Sudhaśāḥ. Kunāla is so named and said to have been Āśoka's son in Buddhist books, e.g. Divyāvadana, pp. 403, 406 ff, 430

eVāyu.

Kulāla-tanayās c-āṣṭau
 bhoktāro Bandhupālitaḥ ³²
 Daśonah sapta ³³ varṣāṇi
 teṣāṃ naptā bhaviṣyati
 rājā Daśarathas tv ³⁵ aṣṭau
 tasya putro bhaviṣyati
 bhavitā nava varṣāṇi
 tasya putras tu Sampratīh ³⁶
 Śālīsūkah ³⁷ samā rājā
 trayodaśa bhaviṣyati
 sapta varṣāṇi ³⁸ Devadharmā
 bhaviṣyati narādhipah
 rājā Śatadhanuś c-āṣṭau
 tasya putro bhaviṣyati
 Vṛhadrathas tu varṣāṇi
 saptāṣṭim ⁴³ bhaviṣyati

Vā genly and Bḍ.

Kunāla-sūnur aṣṭau ³¹ ca
 bhoktā vai Bandhupālitaḥ
 Bandhupālita-dāyādo
 daśa bhāv-Indrapālitaḥ ³⁴
 bhavitā sapta varṣāṇi
 Devavarmā ³⁹ narādhipah
 rājā Śatadhanuś ⁴⁰ c-āṣṭau ⁴¹
 tasya putro bhaviṣyati
 Bṛhadrathas ⁴² ca varṣāṇi
 sapta ⁴⁴ vai bhavitā nṛpah

10

³¹ In *dVā* *adau*, altered to *āda*; *bVā* *āda*: *mVā* °sūnur [atrunur] aṣṭau.

³² Sic, showing that the preceding plurals are probably wrong, through misreading *aṣṭau* as applying to *tanaya* instead of *as* years. The line should probably be—

Kulāla-tanayās c-āṣṭau bhoktā vai Bandhupālitaḥ.

³³ Compare l. 3 of Mt version. There seems to be some metathesis.

³⁴ *Ca*°*a*°*klVā* read *daśamānīndrapālitaḥ*; *a*°*a*°*fmVā* *daśa*°; *bdVā* *daśamānīnd*° (altered in *d* to *daśamānīnd*°); *jVā* *daśamānāndrapālita*. *Bḍ* *bhavitā c-Indrapālitaḥ*, which suggests that *Vā* reading should be *daśa bhāv-Indrapālitaḥ*, and I have emended it so: but it might also be *daś-ābdān Indra*° as suggested in *CVā*.

³⁵ Actually *carṣasamāsv*, no doubt for *Daśarathas tv* (see l. 4 of Mt), and I have emended it so, since *Vs* agrees in this name and places him after *Suyāśas* (see note ³⁰): *cdVs* *Dāśaratha*; *bVs* *Dāśaratna*. *Bh* omits him. Three of his records are extant, see Lüders' List of Brāhmī Inscriptions, nos. 954-6, in *Epig. Ind. x*, Appendix.

³⁶ Cf. note ⁹. *Sampratī* is the Sanskrit

form of Pali *Sāmpadī*. *Sāmpadī* was Kunāla's son (Divyāvadāna, p. 430), and was established in the kingdom (*id.* p. 433, where his descendants are named). See SBE, xxii, 290 note, for *Sampratī*. *Vs*, *Bh* place a king *Sāngata* here, which is no doubt another reading of the same name; *dBh* *Sāmyuta*, an easy misreading of *Sampratī*. *Bh* adds 'son of *Suyāśas*', *Suyāśas-sutāḥ*.

³⁷ First *Śālīyūkah*, then corrected to °*śūkah*. *Vs*, *Bh* corroborate. *Bh*, *cdkVs* *Śālītūka*; *Vs* genly, *sBh* °*śūka*; *jVs* °*śmūka*; *bVs* °*śūlla*: *lVs* *Śālaśūka*. *Bh* genly *Śālīśūkas tatas tasya*; *jBh* °*kas tu Suyāśah*, where *Suyāśah* is meant for a genitive.

³⁸ Actually *varṣāṇi*; see Appendix I, § 1.

³⁹ In *bVā* *Dacav*°. *Vs*, *Bh* *Somaśarman*.

⁴⁰ So *Bḍ*. *Vs*, *Bh* *Śatadhanvan*; *kBh* *Sata*°; *hBh* *Śāta*°; *deVs* *Śāsa*°; *bVs* *Śatadharman*; *qBh* *śatayitvā*. *Vā* *Śatadharas*.

⁴¹ So *Vā*. *Bḍ* merely *c-āpi*.

⁴² So *Bḍ*. *Vs*, *Bh* agree; *cBh* *Uhad*°. *Vā* *Vṛhadaśvas*, but has correct name *Bṛhad-ratha* in p. 31, l. 1: *mVā* omits *ca*.

⁴³ Sic.

⁴⁴ In *dVā* *sama*; *bVā* *samu*.

eVāyu.

ity ete nava Mauryās⁴⁵ tu
ye bhokṣyanti vasundharām
sapta-trimśac-chatam pūrṇam
tebhyah Śuṅgo⁵⁰ bhaviṣyati.

Vā genly and Bḍ.

ity ete nava⁴⁶ Mauryā vai⁴⁷
bhokṣyanti ca⁴⁸ vasundharām
sapta-trimśac-chatam pūrṇam⁴⁹
tebhyah Śuṅgo⁵¹ gamiṣyati⁵². 15

Śuṅgas.

Text—AMt 272, 27-32^a; AVā 99, 337-343^a; Bḍ iii, 74, 150-156^a.

Corresp. passages—CVs iv, 24, 9-11; GBh xii, 1, 16^b-19^a.

The Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmānda give the whole; except that most copies of the Matsya omit l. 8, and all omit l. 3. The Viṣṇu gives a list of the kings, and the Bhāgavata all except the first.

As regards MSS, *ce*Mt invert lines 4, 5; *ke*Mt omits ll. 1-6, 13 and inserts ll. 1, 2, 5, 6 at the end; *ne*Mt omits ll. 4, 5; *g*Vā has only l. 2; *e*Vā omits this dynasty here and inserts it long afterwards, out of place, after the first line about Viśvasphāṇi: *kp*Mt, *lv*Vā, and *bl*Bh want the whole.

The duration of the dynasty is stated by Vā and Bḍ, and by Vṣ generally, to be 112 years; by 7 MSS of Bh and one of Vṣ, 110; and by Bh generally 'over 100 years'. Mt reads 'hundreds two' wrongly for 'ten, two', and with this correction says 112 years. The duration therefore was 112 years. The aggregate of the reigns is 118 years. These virtually agree, if the total of the reigns was nominally raised above the true total by reckoning fractions of years as whole years.

Of the time of the Śuṅgas there are two records, nos. 687, 688 in Lüders' List of Brāhmī Inscriptions in Epig. Ind. x, Appendix. Another record assigned to their time, no. 905 in that list, mentions a king Bhāgavata, but he does not appear to be the Śuṅga king Bhāgavata, as the lineage is quite different.

⁴⁵ Actually *nara Mlauryyās* (an easy misreading of *nava*): but it has mentioned 12 kings.

⁴⁶ So Vā, Bḍ: *nava* may have been substituted since they name only 9 kings. Vṣ names and says 10—

evam Mauryā* daśa* bhūpatayo bhaviṣyanti abda*-śatam sapta-trimśad*-uttaram: where **k*Vṣ *Soryyā*, *lv*Vṣ *Mauryā* [*dayo*], see Appendix II, § 1: **j*Vṣ *adda*, *h*Vṣ *aṣṭa*, *k*Vṣ *arū*: **h*Vṣ *vimśad*. Bh says 10, though it names only 9—

Mauryā hy ete* daśa nṛpāḥ sapta-trimśac chat-ōttaram
samā bhokṣyanti pṛthivīm Kalau, Kurukul-ōdvaha:

where **jr*Bh *tv* ete, *a*Bh *te te*: *d*Bh reads the first line thus—

Maur[v]yā ete śata-nṛpāḥ sapta-trimś-ōttaram śatam.

⁴⁷ So Bḍ, *a*⁴Vā *Mūrjā vai*; *a*¹*a*³*bkl*Vā *Mūrtyā*^o; *d*Vā *nava* [*Su*] *Mūrtyā*^o (altered to *Naṁda-sambhūtā* wrongly): *fm*Vā *Mauryā ye*, *Cā*²*g*Vā *bhūpā ye*; *j*Vā *yoyā* (or *yopā*) *yo*.

⁴⁸ In *a*¹*a*³*a*¹*bd*Vā *ye bhokṣyanti*: *kl*Vā *yo*^o.

⁴⁹ Similarly Vṣ, Bh; see note ⁴⁶: *d*Vā *chatam* (altered to *chatāt*) *pūrṇāt*.

⁵⁰ Actually *Śuṅko*.

⁵¹ So *a*¹*bd**fm*Vā, Bḍ; *k*Vā *Śugo*; *CV*ā *tu gaur*: but *a*²-*j*Vā *Śuṅgān*, which *AV*ā adopts and seems preferable.

⁵² *CV*ā *bhaviṣyati*. Vṣ says—

teṣām ante* pṛthivīm* Śuṅgā bhokṣyanti: where **lv*Vṣ *anvetām*; **abl*Vṣ add *daśa*: *j*Vṣ *crp*. Bh omits this statement.

SUNGAS

31

Puṣyamitras¹ tu senānīr² uddhṛtya³ sa⁴ Brhadratham⁵
 kārayiṣyati⁶ vai rājyaṁ | kārayiṣyati vai rājyaṁ
 ṣaṭ-trimśati⁷ samā nrpaḥ | samāḥ ṣaṣṭim⁸ sad-aiva⁹ tu
 Agnimitraḥ sutaś c-aṣṭau bhaviṣyati samā nrpaḥ¹⁰
 bhavitāpi Vasujyeṣṭhaḥ¹¹ | bhavitā cāpi Sujyeṣṭhaḥ¹²
 sapta¹³ varṣāni vai nrpaḥ¹⁴ | sapta varṣāni vai tataḥ
 Vasumitraḥ¹⁵ suto¹⁶ bhāvyo daśa varṣāni pārthivaḥ¹⁷
 tato 'ndhrakaḥ¹⁸ same dve tu¹⁹ tasya putro bhaviṣyati²⁰

¹ So Mt genly, IVs. Vā genly, kMt, Bḍ, Vṣ *Puṣpa*^o; ceMt, dfklmVā *Putra*^o here, but *Puṣpa*^o or *Puṣya*^o in l. 3 (see note¹⁰); kVṣ *Prakhya*^o by an easy misreading: nMt *Puṣpamitrasya* (omitting *tu*): bVā *Putra*^h. Bh omits him. Vṣ says—

tataḥ Puṣpamitraḥ senā-patiḥ svāminam hatvā rājyaṁ kariṣyati.

² In ceMt *sa se*^o; bVā *su-se*^o; gMt *senā-sanīr*; eMt omits *tu*.

³ In bḥjMt, eVā, uddhṛtya; ceknMt *samuddhṛtya* (omitting *sa*).

⁴ So Mt, eVā: jMt *ca*. Vā genly *vai*: bdfmVā, Bḍ *tu*.

⁵ So Vā, Bḍ, jMt. Mt genly *thān*; eVā *thah*: cekMt *sadā grhāt*.

⁶ So Mt: jMt *kariṣyati sa*.

⁷ So Mt genly; nMt *ṣaḍ-trimśati* (= *ṣaṭ-trimśati*). ACjkMt *ṣaṭ-trimśat tu*.

⁸ So Vā, Bḍ.

⁹ So Vā. Bḍ *sa c-aiva*. These readings are no doubt corruptions of *ṣaṭ-trimśad eva* in Pkt form.

¹⁰ This line is only in Vā, Bḍ. Bḍ has—
 Agnimitro nrpaś c-aṣṭau bhaviṣyati samā nrpaḥ;

where the first *nrpaś* should no doubt be *sutaś*. Vā reads—

Puṣpamitra-sutaś c-aṣṭau bhaviṣyanti samā nrpaḥ;

where singulars have obviously been wrongly converted into plurals through misapplying *aṣṭau* to *suta* instead of to *samā*. It should be—

Puṣpamitra-sutaś c-aṣṭau bhaviṣyati samā nrpaḥ;

as eVā shows by its reading—

tat-suto 'gnimitra-aṣṭau * bhaviṣyati samā nrpaḥ;

where read **mitro* 'ṣṭau and 'nrpaḥ. Vṣ

and Bh name *Agnimitra*. Vṣ adds *asy-ātmajo*, 'son of Puṣyamitra'.

¹¹ So Mt genly: gMt *bhavitā vai Vasuśreṣṭhaḥ*; fMt *lā c-aiva Suś*^o; ceMt *lā c* (ceMt *v*) *Asurajyeṣṭhaḥ*; bMt *lā c-āpi Sujyeṣṭhaḥ* (and lMt *crp*), as in Vā, Bḍ.

¹² So a²afkmVā, Bḍ. Vṣ genly and Bh agree. In eVā *Sajy*^o; Ca²a²Vā *taj-jy*^o; bVṣ *Sujeṣṭa*; jVā *Sudyetaḥ*; bḍVā *Suṣaṣṭhaḥ* (altered in *d* to *Suṣaṣṭhaḥ*); kVṣ *Jyeṣṭha*; hḥVṣ *crp*. *Sutaḥ* added in aBh.

¹³ In bMt *sama*.

¹⁴ In fḥjMt *tataḥ*.

¹⁵ So all; except ceMt, a¹⁻⁴Vā *mitra*; lMt *Vasuputras*; jMt *Vāyumitras*; dMt *Sumitras tu*.

¹⁶ So Vā genly, ceMt. Bḍ, eVā *tato*. Mt genly *tathā*.

¹⁷ So Vā, Bḍ: beMt *vai nrpaḥ*. Mt genly *vai tataḥ*. After this king kVṣ inserts a king *Vajramitra* besides the *Vajramitra* in l. 9.

¹⁸ There is great variation in this name. Vā genly *'ndhrakaḥ*; kMt, a²Vā *'ndhakaḥ* (kVā *tesāmdhakaḥ*): 4 MSS of CVā *Dhrukaḥ*; fmVā *Dhrakaḥ*; 2 MSS of CVā *Vrkaḥ*: Mt genly *'ntakaḥ*; eMt *Taka*; jMt *Nukaḥ*; lMt *'ṣṭakaḥ*. All these should prob. be read with *avagraha*. Vṣ genly *Arḍraka*; bhVṣ *Odruka*. Bḍ *Bhadraḥ*; eVā *Madraḥ*. Bh genly *Bhadraḥ*; gBh *Bhad*^o. *Andhraka* seems most probable.

¹⁹ So Mt genly, bḍefkmVā, Bḍ. Vā genly *samā*^o; dMt *samā*^o; ceMt *samā dvau tu*: but a¹nMt *samāḥ sapta*; kMt *samohamtu*.

²⁰ So Mt; jMt *putrau bhaviṣyataḥ*. This half line is in a²a²klVā *bhaviṣyati suto 'sya vai*; bVā *'sutaṣya*^o; defmVā *'sutasya*^o (altered in *d* to *'sutaḥ sa*^o); Ca²a²Vā *'sutaś ca*^o. Bḍ *'nrpaś ca vai*.

bhaviṣyati²¹ samās²² tasmāt²³
 trīṇy evaṃ²⁷ sa Pulindakah²⁸
 bhaviṣyati ca Yomeghas³¹
 trīṇi varṣāṇi vai tataḥ
 bhavitā Vajramitras tu³⁴
 samā rājā punar nava³⁷
 dvā-trimśat tu³⁹ Samābhāgaḥ⁴⁰
 Samābhāgāt tato⁴² nṛpaḥ⁴³
 bhaviṣyati sutas tasya Devabhūmih⁴⁵ samā daśa⁴⁶

bhaviṣyati²⁴ samās²⁵ tasmāt²⁰
 tisra eva²⁹ Pulindakah³⁰
 rājā Ghoṣaḥ sutaś³² cāpi
 varṣāṇi bhavitā trayah³³
 sapta³⁵ vai Vajramitras³⁶ tu
 samā rājā tataḥ punah³⁸
 dvā-trimśad bhavitā cāpi⁴¹
 samā Bhāgavato⁴⁴ nṛpaḥ 10

²¹ So Mt: cMt °syanti.

²² Samas in CMt.

²³ In bMt tasyās.

²⁴ So bdemVā, Bḍ. Vā genly °syanti.

²⁵ In lVā sutās: aḍfghjklmqrBh say sutaḥ.

²⁶ In eVā tasya.

²⁷ So Mt genly: bnMt °evā; kMt trīṇi vai; ḍfgjmMt tisro vai. See Appendix I, § iii.

²⁸ So Mt mostly: bMt sa Pulindakah: mMt °Numandanah, jMt Madhunan°; fgMt Marunan°; dMt Medhunanakah: kMt merely nṛpaḥ: ceMt read this half line trīṇi varṣāṇi vai tataḥ, giving no name.

²⁹ In eVā tripuśrava or tripu°.

³⁰ So mVā. Bḍ and other Vā read the plural °kāḥ wrongly: eVā Mulindakah. Vṣ genly Pulindaka; lVṣ Pul°; kVṣ Pralīṅgaka. Bh Pulinda.

³¹ This line is only in ḍfgjmMt. So ḍfgMt, but fg omit ca: mMt °va Yomegha; jMt °sa Yomeghas. Yome may be a misreading of Ghoṣa see note³².

³² Vā genly Ghoṣa (mVā Dhoṣa) sutaś, for Ghoṣaḥ sutaś, as Bh has. Bḍ and dVā Ghoṣaḥ tataḥ. Vṣ genly Ghoṣavasū; bVṣ Ghoṣaka; kVṣ Yoṣavasū; hVṣ by inversion Soghavamū; cBh Ghopa: eVā has a different line—

trīṇi varṣāṇi bhavitā rājā Ghoṣavasur nṛpaḥ.

³³ So Vā and Bḍ. See Appendix I, § iii.

³⁴ So Mt genly, eVā; eMt Vajramitras; kMt Yajñam°: fgMt bhaviṣyate Vajramitrah; jMt Vajramitras ca bhavitā.

³⁵ So Bḍ. Vā tato.

³⁶ So Bḍ. Bh and Vṣ genly agree: hBh Vajramitra; cBh Vajrā°; ekBh Vraja°; nBh Vāṇna°; fgVṣ Vakṣa°; cVṣ Vadrā°; pBh

Vajramindra. Vā genly Vikramitras; dVā Vikr

³⁷ So cMt; ḍfgjkmMt navaḥ; emMt navā: other Mt bhavaḥ.

³⁸ So Vā, Bḍ; eVā catur-daśa.

³⁹ So Mt genly; cenMt ca for tu; dMt omits tu; bfgMt dvā-trimśati; jMt sa dvā-trimśat.

⁴⁰ Samabh° in cMt; eMt Samambh°.

⁴¹ So Vā. Bḍ vāpi.

⁴² So Mt genly; beMt Samabh°; kMt samā bhoktā°; jMt Samābhāg-ānugo.

⁴³ Vṣaḥ in bMt, adding an extra king.

⁴⁴ So Vā, Bḍ. Bh and Vṣ genly agree; cenBh Bhagavato.

⁴⁵ So Mt, eVā, Bḍ. Vā Kṣemabhūmih here but Devā° in the next list (l. 2). Vṣ Devabhūti. Bh Devabhūtir iti śrutah; gBh °bhūr iti viś°, but °bhūti afterwards.

⁴⁶ In eMt vaśah.

⁴⁷ So ḍfgmMt, dVā, Bḍ, and 2 MSS of CVā: a°a°klVā and 4 MSS of CVā Śrīṅga. bVā Ścuṅga. Vā genly tuṅga: eVā Śaṅka; cMt Śuddha; eMt Śraddha. Mt genly kṣudra: jMt trayodaś-āṅga; kMt has this half line, ity ete daśa Maurvās tu [me]. Vṣ says—

ity ete daśa° Śuṅgā dvādaś°-ōttaraṃ varṣa-śatam prthivīm bhokṣyanti; tātah Kanvān° eṣā° bhūr yāsyati:

where °lVṣ dvādaśa; °aVṣ daś-; °lVṣ Kanvān; °kVṣ eyān. Bh has—

Śuṅgā° daś-nite bhokṣyanti bhūmih° varṣa-śat-ādbikam

tātah Kanvān iyaṃ bhūmir yāsyaty alpa-guṇān, nṛpa:

where °deBh Śuṅgā, hBh Sumbhā; °cehjkmlmBh daśa (marg. correction bhūmih in jBh).

KĀNVĀYANAS (ŚUNĠABHṚTYAS)

33

daśaite Śuṅga⁴⁷-rājāno bhokṣyantāmām⁴⁸ vasundharām
 śatam pūrṇam⁴⁹ daśa dve ca⁵⁰ tataḥ⁵¹ Kaṇvān⁵² gamiṣyati⁵³.

Kānvāyanas (Śuṅgabhr̥tyas).

Text—AMt 272, 32^b-37; AVā 99, 343^b-347; Bḍ iii, 74, 156^b-160^a.

Corresp. passages—CVṣ iv, 24, 12; GBh xii, 1, 19^b-21.

The Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa give the whole; but they all differ in the last part, where the Matsya version is placed on the left, the Vāyu on the right, and the Brahmāṇḍa in the notes along with the concluding parts of the Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata. The names Kaṇva, Kāṇva, and Kānvāyana are often sadly corrupted, and many of the variations are mentioned in the notes to show how simple and well-known names can be corrupted.

As regards MSS, *bdfjlm*Mt omit line 6; *gVā* has only the last line; *eVā* omits the whole here and inserts it long afterwards, out of place, after the first line about Viśvasphāni: *hpm*Mt, *hVā*, *hVṣ*, and *bBh* want the whole.

The duration of the dynasty is stated to be 45 years and agrees with the aggregate of the reigns.

Amātyo Vasudevas¹ tu bālyād vyasaninām nṛpam²

⁴⁸ In *dMt* °syante tām; *bMt* °syanty eva; *jMt* bhojyante te.

⁴⁹ In *bMt* śara-pūrṇa-.

⁵⁰ So Vā, Bḍ: *fmVā darā dve ca*; *bVā* +daśarādava. Mt *śate dve ca*: *jMt* reads this line—

aṣṭa-trimś-ādhikā samyag varṣāṇām śata-pañcakam.

⁵¹ So Mt. Vā, Bḍ *tebhyaḥ*.

⁵² Bḍ *Kaṇvam*; *eVā* *Kaṇtho*; *mVā* *ā anga*; *bfVā* *Kaṇvā*; *dVā* *Kaṇvo*. Vā genly *kiṁ vā*: *a°a°Vā Śaikam*. Mt genly *Śuṅgān*; *nMt* *Śuṅgam*; *ceMt* *tungo*; *dMt* *Śuṅgād gāna*: *a°bMt* *svargam*, °gā, °ga; *fgMt* boldly read this half line, *tatas te svargagāmināḥ*. *Kaṇvān* seems the correct word, if we read *gamiṣyati*.

⁵³ *Maḥ* being understood, see p. 28, note ²¹. But *bMt*, *eVā* *bhaviṣyati*; *cenMt* *haniṣyati*, which would be good, if we read *tataḥ Śuṅgān haniṣyati*.

¹ So Mt genly, *eVā*, Bḍ: *dmMt* *Vās°*; *bMt* *Vasudevasya* (omitting *tu*). Vā genly

apārīhivasudevas; *CVā* °devam; *dVā* °vaḥ *Sudevas*. Vṣ says—

Devabhūtiṁ tu Śuṅga-rājānam vyasaninām* tasyaiv-āmātyaḥ Kaṇvo¹ Vasudeva-nāmā nipātya + svayam avanim bhoktā:

where **kVṣ* *vyavaśīnam*; +*IVṣ* *Kāṇvo*, *kVṣ* *Kāśvā*; +*IVṣ* *Vāsudeva-nām-āpatya*. Bh has—

Śuṅgam hatvā Devabhūtiṁ* Kaṇvo 'mātyas¹ tu + kāmīnam

svayam kariṣyate rājyam¹ Vasudevo mahā-matih:

where **hBh* °bhṛtiṁ, *lBh* °hūtiṁ; +*dBh* *Kaṇv-āmātyas*; +*kBh* *śu*; +*dBh* *ca bhokṣyate rājyam*, *qBh* *kariṣye rājyam ca*. See p. 32, note ⁴⁵.

² So Vā genly, Bḍ: *fvā* *bālyā-vy°*; *eVā* *balad vyasaninām nṛpaḥ*; *lVā* *bālyāṁd vasati nṛpam*. But *a°a°a°cefgklm*Mt *prasahya* (*cen*, °hyā) *vyasanī* (*n*, °nūr; *l*, °nā) *nṛpam* (*l*, °paḥ; *a°a°a°cek*, °pa); where the true reading should be *prasahya vyasanīm nṛpam*, see Appendix I, § ii. *CGVbMt* corrupt it to *prasahya hy avanīm nṛpaḥ*;

F

Devabhūmim ath-ōtsādyā³Śauṅgas⁶ tu⁷ bhavitā nṛpaḥbhaviṣyati samā⁹ rājā nava¹⁰ Kāṇvāyano¹¹ dvijāḥ¹²Bhūmimitraḥ¹³ sutas tasya¹⁴ caturdaśa¹⁵ bhaviṣyatiNārāyaṇaḥ¹⁶ sutas tasya¹⁷

bhavitā dvādaśaiva tu

Suśarmā¹⁹ tat-sutaś²⁰ cāpi bhaviṣyati daśaiva tu²¹ity²² ete Śuṅga-bhṛtyās²³ tusmṛtāḥ²⁶ Kāṇvāyanā²⁷ nṛpāḥDevabhūmim⁴ tath-ōtpātya⁵Śuṅgeṣu⁸ bhavitā nṛpaḥKāṇvāyano¹¹ dvijāḥ¹²bhavitā dvādaśa samās¹⁸

tasmān Nārāyano nṛpaḥ

catvāras²⁴ Tuṅga-kṛtyās²⁵ tenṛpāḥ Kāṇvāyanā²⁸ dvijāḥ

5

and a²djmMt amend it to *prasahya vyasan-āturam*. The expression *vyasanā nṛpaḥ* occurs in AVā 88, 122.

³ So Mt genly: cMt Pkt *ath-ōchādya*; fJMt *tat-ōtsādyā*.

⁴ So Bd. Vā⁶ bhūmis wrongly: bVā *Devabhūmi[samādeśādeśete]*. See p. 32, note ⁴⁶.

⁵ So a¹a²Vā; fJmVā *tat-ōtpātya*; kVā *†tathānpātya*; dVā *tathonyadya*, bVā *°nya-dhā*; Vā genly *tato 'nyaś ca*. But eVā *ath-ōddhṛtya* or *°dhatya*. Bd *tato hatvā*.

⁶ So ACdmMt: jMt *Souṅgas*; kMt *Śuṅgaḥ*; cJmMt *Suṅgaḥ*; eJmMt *Sugaḥ*; eVā *Śubhaḥ*; bMt *Saurah*: nMt *Śuṅgam*.

⁷ In ccknMt, eVā *sa*; fJmMt *saṁ*.

⁸ So a¹mVā, Bd. Vā genly *Śrñ°*; fVā *Muñ°*.

⁹ Altered in dVā to *hanīsyati sa vai*. This line occurs previously in Mt, see p. 21, note ²⁴: jMt there *daśa śaṭ ca samā*, here *dvijo daśa samā*; kMt there has this half line, *catvāriṃśat samā rājyaṁ*.

¹⁰ So Mt, Vā: bMt *aṁva* here, but *nava* earlier. Bd *pañca*.

¹¹ So Mt genly here and in the earlier passage. Bd, nMt *Kaṇ°*. Corruptions are many, as eMt *Kāṇvāyana*; kMt *Kāṇvāyana*, *Kāṇthā°*; lMt *Kāṇthāyana*, *Kāṇmā°*; fJmMt *Kāṇthāyana*, *Kāṇtā°*; dMt *Kāṇvāyate*; bMt *Kācāyate*. Vā genly, cJmMt *Kāṇthāyana*; dVā *Kaṇta°*; bVā *Kāṇtapanu*; eVā *Kāṇthāmana*; kVā *Kāṇcayana*; fJmVā and 2 MSS of CVā *Kāṇvāyana*; &c. Vā, Bh *Kāṇva*, see note ¹.

¹² So a¹a²ceJmMt; bdfJmMt *dvijāḥ*: other Mt *nṛpāḥ* redundantly, and so all Mt in earlier passage. Vā, Bd *tu saḥ*. Vā, Bh *svayam*.

¹³ So Mt genly, Bd, Vā. This line occurs previously in Mt, see p. 21, note ²⁴; where cMt *Bhūmiputraḥ*, eMt *°putraṁ*. Vā, mMt *Bhūmimitraḥ*. Bh, abVā *Bhūmītra*; cBh *Bhūrm°*: lVā *Bhūmiputra*.

¹⁴ In nMt *sutasya*; mMt *tatasya*. Vā adds *tat-putro*; Bh *tasya putras*.

¹⁵ So Mt. Vā, Bd *catur-vimśad*.

¹⁶ CMt *Nārāthanaḥ*; nMt *Nārāyana*. Vā, Bh agree; gBh *Pārāy°*.

¹⁷ So Bh *tasya sutaḥ*.

¹⁸ So bdfmVā, Bd. Vā genly Pkt *saṁā*.

¹⁹ So Mt genly, Vā, Bd. Vā agrees: cJmVā *Susarman*; dVā *Suśanmatih*; eVā *Sudharmā*. Bh omits him, but gBh has preserved him thus (also mentioned as v.r. in gBh)—

Pārāyaṇasya bhavitā Suśarmā nāma viśrutaḥ.

²⁰ In lVā *tasy-ātmajaḥ*; kVā *Nārāyaṇasy-ānujaḥ*.

²¹ So Mt. Vā *saṁā daśa*. Bd *catuḥ-samāḥ*.

²² In bMt *ya*.

²³ So Mt genly: kMt *Śrñ°*; cJmMt *Suñ°*; lMt *Suga°*; jMt *Cāṅga°* or *cāṅga°* (see p. 32, note ⁴⁷); bMt *Muṅganṛtyās*; eMt *Bhūṅgaratyās* (omitting *tu*).

²⁴ So eVā. Vā genly *caturas*: see Appendix I, § iv.

²⁵ So Vā genly; bVā *°kr[tvā]tyās*; dVā *°lāṁtyās*: eVā nearly correctly *Śuṅga-vṛtyās*: see Appendix II, § iii. For Bd, Vā, Bh see note ⁴².

²⁶ In eMt *smutuh*; mMt *sthitāḥ*.

²⁷ With variations (see note ¹¹), as eMt *Kāṇjāy°*; lMt *Kagvayata*.

²⁸ Amended. Vā *Kāṇthāyanā* with vv. rr.

ANDHRAS

35

catvāras tu ²⁹ dvijā hy ete ³⁰Kaṇvā ³¹ bhokṣyanti vai ³² mahīmcatvāriṃśat pañca ³³ cāiva ³⁴

bhokṣyantīmān vasundharām

ete ³⁵ prañata-sāmantā

bhaviṣyā dhārmikāś ca ye

yeśām ³⁶ paryāya ³⁷-kāle tu ³⁸bhūmir Āndhrān-gamiṣyati ⁴⁰.

bhāvyāḥ prañata-sāmantāś

catvāriṃśat ca pañca ca

teśām paryāya-kāle tu ³⁹bhūr Āndhrānām ⁴¹ bhaviṣyati ⁴².

Andhras.

Text—AMt 273, 1-17^a; AVā 99, 348-358^a; Bđ iii, 74, 160^b-170.

Corresp. passages—CVś iv, 24, 12-13; GBh xii, 1, 22-28.

This dynasty is given in full by the Matsya, while the accounts in the Vāyu and Brahmanḍa are far from perfect. The Bhāgavata and Viṣṇu give a list of the kings though not completely, with some details at the beginning and end.

The defects in the MSS will appear from the following notices of the kings; but eVā, which stands midway between the Matsya and Vāyu, has misplaced the first portion down to Svāti, inserting it long afterwards, out of place, after the first line about Viśvasphāni: *hpMt* have nothing; *hVā* omits ll. 1-21.

²⁹ So *jMt*. *Mt* genly *catvāriṃśad*; *bdnMt* *śa*: see Appendix I, § iv.

³⁰ But *jMt* omits *hy*; *nMt* omits *hy ete*: *bMt* cite (for *cāite*).

³¹ So *Mt* genly: *CfgmMt* *Kānvā*; *nMt* *Kaṇvo*; *eMt* *Kāvo*; *lMt* *Kagvo*.

³² In *lMt* crp: *jMt* reads this half line, *bhokṣyante prthivīm imām*.

³³ So *Mt* genly: *bMt* *°riṃśa nagham* (or *nadyam*).

³⁴ In *jMt* *cāite*.

³⁵ So *Mt* genly: *jMt* *gate*.

³⁶ In *bcdefyjkMt* *teśām*.

³⁷ In *lMt* *payoja*.

³⁸ So *Mt* genly: *eMt* *kāleṣu*.

³⁹ So *Vā* genly: *ClVā* *kāleṣu*, *bdVā* *kal°*.

⁴⁰ So *Mt* genly; *fMt* *An°*: *gMt* *Āndhrām*, *eMt* *°rā*. This half line is in *a°bnMt* *bhūmir* (*n, mūmir*) *iddhā bhaviṣyati*; *lMt* *munir i bh°* (short); *jMt* *bhūmih sāndrā* (for *s-Āndhrā?*) *bh°*.

⁴¹ All *Vā* readings are crp, and this is an emendation. *Bhūr* is represented thus,

a°a°Vā tur; *Ca°gklVā tar*; *a°Vā ter*; *fmVā star*; *bdVā ster* (altered to *ter* in *d*). *Āndhrānām*, or rather its Pkt form *Āndhrāna*, is represented thus, *a°fgmVā Āndhrā nu*; *a°a°bdVā Āndhā nu*; *Ca°gklVā Āndhā tu*. But *eVā* has *Mt* reading crp, *bhumiv-Āntān gamiṣyati*.

⁴² *Bđ* and *Bh* have not got the concluding lines (5 in *Mt*, 3 in *Vā*). *Bđ* has—

Kaṇvāyanās tu catvāraś catvāriṃśat ca pañca ca

samā bhokṣyanti prthivīm punar Āndhrān gamiṣyati.

Bh similarly—

Kaṇvāyanā° ime bhūmim catvāriṃśat ca pañca ca

śatāni trīṇi bhokṣyanti varṣānām° ca Kalau yuge:

where **jlbh Kaṇ°*; **qBh varṣāni*. *Vś* says—
ete *Kaṇvāyanās° catvāraḥ pañca-catvāriṃśad-varṣāni bhūpatayo bhaviṣyanti*:

where **eVś Kaṇv°*, *hVś Kāv°*.

The Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa, Bhāgavata, and Viṣṇu all say there were 30 kings, though they do not give 30 names. The Vā MSS name only 17, 18, or 19, and *eVā* which is the fullest names only 25; Brahmāṇḍa only 17; Bhāgavata 23; and Viṣṇu 24, or 22 and 23 in two MSS. The Matsya says there were 19 kings, but 3 MSS (*agn*) actually name 30, and the others vary from 28 to 21. Before noticing the differences in them and the other authorities, it will be convenient to set out the list of the kings, of whom 30 are clearly named; and 30 is no doubt the correct number.

1 Simuka	11 Skandasvāti	21 Cakora
2 Kṛṣṇa ✓	12 Mrgendra	22 Śivasvāti
3 Śrī-Śātakarṇi (Śrī-1. Mallak)	13 Kuntala	✓ 23 Gautamīputra
4 Pūrṇotsaṅga	14 Svātivarna	24 Pulomā
5 Śkandhastambhi	15 Pulomāvi (Padumān)	[24a Śātakarṇi]
6 Śātakarṇi	16 Ariṣṭakarna	25 Śivaśrī
7 Lambodara	17 Hāla (= Sakunadhara)	26 Śivaskandha
8 Āpilaka (Divilaka)	18 Mantalaka or Patta-laka	✓ 27 Yajñaśrī
9 Meghasvāti	19 Purīndrasena	28 Vijaya
10 Svāti	20 Sundara Śātakarṇi	29 Candāśrī
		30 Pulomāvi

The lists in the MSS stand thus, omitting at present no. 24a who is mentioned only in *eVā*. Mt MSS name the following (*fgm* Mt calling no. 15 Pulomāvi a second Meghasvāti), the numbers within brackets denoting those who are omitted:—*CGV* have 27 kings (nos. 2, 5, 15 omitted); *a*¹*a*²*a*³*a*⁴ 28 (5, 15); *b* 27 (9, 20, 22); *c* 27 (2, 5, 20); *e* 25 (2, 5, 20, 23, 24); *f* 27 (24, 25, 29); *j* 24 (5, 7, 8, 18, 19, 29); *k* 21 (5, 9-11, 20-23, 29); *l* 20 (2, 5, 9, 12, 13, 20-24); *m* 27 (1, 2, 5); *n* 29 (20); *d* 30, and repeats 6-10; *g* 30, and repeats 10-14 and 15 (with correct name Pulomāvi); *hp* Mt have nothing. All Vā MSS, other than *ehVā*, name nos. 1-3, 6-8, 15-23, 27-30; except that *Ca*²*a*³*f* omit no. 21; *k* no. 8; *l* 8, 21; *m* 21, 30: *h* has lost the first part and begins with no. 19: *a*¹*a*⁴ apparently insert no. 8 twice; *m* repeats 3, 6 after no. 8. All these Vā name no. 20 Sundara merely as Śātakarṇi.

But *eVā* is peculiar and its list is broken up into three sets. It begins thus, nos. 11, 18, 19, 20 (calling him Sundara), 21; then reverting mentions 12-15, 24a, 25-30; and long afterwards (see p. 35) names 1-4, 6-10 (corrupting no. 9's name). It thus omits 5, 16, 17, 22-24, yet makes its total 25 by including 24a, who is considered further on.

Bd names 1-3, 6, 8, 15-20, 22, 23, 27-30. Vṣ mentions 1-4, 6-9, 15-30; but *bVṣ* omits 4, 6; *kVṣ* no. 21; *lVṣ*, 28, 29. Bh names 1-4, 7-9, 15-20; but *bBh* have nothing.

All the authorities keep the order of the kings as in the above list, except that 5 Mt MSS show three discrepancies. Two are small, namely, (1) *d* Mt mentions 6-10 and immediately repeats them; (2) *n* Mt inverts nos. 5 and 6, and mentions no. 19 twice, first after no. 13 and again in his proper place. The third discrepancy concerns nos. 10-15: *g* Mt names these in their place and repeats them after no. 29; and *b* Mt omit them from their place and insert them (*l* omitting 12, 13) after no. 29. These discrepancies appear to be mere mistakes due to carelessness, or to lacunae or disarrangements of leaves in the MSS copied.

Every king in the list (except 24a) is mentioned by most of the MSS of at least two Purāṇas, except nos. 5, 10-14. No. 5 occurs only in Mt, but 5 MSS name him. Nos. 10-14 are mentioned only by Mt and *eVā*; but no. 14 appears in

ANDHRAS

37

them all; nos. 10, 11 in all except *lMt*; and nos. 12, 13 in all except *lMt*. They seem to be genuine, and help to constitute the total number 30. The general consensus then establishes the number, names, and order in the above list.

No. 24a, *Śātakarṇi*, mentioned only in *eVā*, is not no. 20, who is called *Śātakarṇi* merely in all other *Vā* MSS and in *Bd*, for *Mt*, *Vā*, *Bd*, and *eVā* agree that the latter reigned only one year (p. 41, l. 23), while the description of the former in *eVā* is l. 28 on p. 42, and assigns 29 years to him. There is no line like it except l. 32 about *Yajñaśrī*, but he is not apparently *Yajñaśrī* whom *eVā* mentions in his proper place. According to the *eVā* list he should come presumably either immediately after no. 15, or immediately before no. 25 *Śivaśrī*. The only indication I can find bearing upon this puzzle occurs in *IVs*, which regards *Śātakarṇi Śivaśrī* as two, (1) *Śātakarṇi*, (2) *Śivaśrī* (see p. 42, note ¹), and so places a *Śātakarṇi* exactly in one of the two positions required by *eVā*. If this *Śātakarṇi* then be real, his place would be 24a. A line found in only one MS should not be rejected straight away (see *Introdn.* § 31), hence I have included him in the list in that position by l. 28; but, since his existence is vouched for by no other authority and he would raise the number of the kings to 31, that line is enclosed in brackets. If he is genuine, we may suppose that the total 30 is a round number.

Many of the kings bore the name *Śātakarṇi*, and it is spelt in many ways, the first part as *Śāti*, *Śānta*, *Śānti*, *Śita* (with *s* often instead of *ś* in these forms), and the latter part as *karni*, *karna*, *koṇa*, *varṇa*, &c. It is needless to state all such variations in the text and notes, and the form *Śātakarṇi* is adopted because it agrees best with the Pkt form *Sātakani* generally found on coins. The names *Svālikarṇa* and *Svālivarṇa* occur sometimes and seem to be merely variants of it (see notes ⁵⁷, ⁶¹, ⁶³). All these forms may obviously be Sanskritizations of that one Pkt name.

Prof. Rapson's 'Indian Coins, Andhras, &c.' elucidate this dynasty partially. I have not attempted, as it is not my function here, to identify the names in this list with those mentioned in inscriptions and on coins, except those of the first three kings who seem clear. The first king, whose correct name was *Simuka Śātavāhana*, is mentioned in *Lüders' List of Brāhmī Inscriptions*, no. 1113 (*Epig. Ind.* x, Appendix); the second *Kṛṣṇa* or *Kanha* in *id.* no. 1144; and the third *Śrī-Śātakarṇi* in *id.* nos. 346, 1114. In other inscriptions the following kings are mentioned—*Gotamīputa Siri Sātakani*, nos. 1123, 1125; *Siri Sivamaka Sada*, no. 1279; *Sati* (= *Śakti*?) *Sirimata*, no. 1112; *Vāsithīputa Siri Pulumāvi*, nos. 1106, 1124 (and probably 1100); *Siri Pulumāvi*, no. 1248; *Vāsithīputa Siri Pulumāvi*, nos. 1122-3; *Vāsathīputa Catarāpana Satakani*, no. 1120; *Gotamīputa Siri Sātakani*, no. 1123, and *Sadakani*, no. 1125; *Sivakhada* (or *Sadakhada*) *Nāga siri*, no. 1186; *Gotamīputa Siri Yaña*, nos. 987, 1024, 1146, 1340; *Vāsithīputa Cadasata*, no. 1341; and *Mādhariputa Sirivira Purisadata* of the *Ikhākus*, nos. 1202-4 (see note ⁷⁸).

It may be noted that one line in certain *Mt* MSS differs from all the others in its expression, namely, l. 30 about *Yajñaśrī* (see note thereto). He is spoken of there in the present tense, *kurute*: see *Introdn.* § 21, note.

The total of the individual reigns (excluding no. 24a) is only 442½ years, even if we take the longest periods wherever there is a difference; but the whole duration is said to have been 460 years in *Mt*, 411 in *Vā*, and 456 in *Bd*, *Vs*, and *Bh*. The addition of no. 24a would increase the first total.

Simuka
Kanha
Satakani

Naga siri

Naga siri

Kānvāyanāms¹ tato bhrtyāḥ²
 Suśarmāṇaḥ³ prasahya⁴ tam⁵
 Śuṅgānām⁶ c-aiya yac cheṣam⁷
 kṣapitvā tu⁸ balīyasah⁹
 Śisuko¹⁰ 'ndhraḥ¹¹ sa-jātiyah¹²
 prāpsyat-īmām vasundharām
 trayo-vimśat¹³ samā rājā Simukas¹⁴ tu bhaviṣyati¹⁵

Kānvāyanām³ ath-ōddhrtya⁴
 Suśarmāṇam prasahya tam⁵
 Śuṅgānām¹¹ c-āpi yac chiṣtam¹²
 kṣapayitvā¹⁶ balām tadā¹⁶
 Sindhuko hy Andhra-jātiyah¹⁹
 prāpsyat-īmām vasundharām

¹ This line is in Mt. This name is often corrupted as in p. 34, note¹¹; and first vowel is long or short. In nMt 'yanāms; fMt 'yanī; Mt genly 'yanās, which should be 'yanāms, as the accus. is required.

² So dfgkMt; bMt tadā°: jMt tato bhrtyān. Mt genly tato bhūpāḥ. But eMt tadodhrtya; cMt tad-ōddhrtya; so nMt erp. Bhrtyāḥ is prob. correct, cf. Vṣ, Bh; the plural here may refer to 'Simuka and his fellow-tribesmen' in l. 3. Vṣ says—

Suśarmāṇam Kānvām* ca bhrtyo¹ balāt[†] Śipraka¹-nāmā hatvā^{||} Andhra^{||}-jātiyo vasudhām bhokṣyati:

where *klVṣ Kānvām, bVṣ Kānvāyanām; †alVṣ sa-bhrtyām, jVṣ sa-bhrtyo, bVṣ sad-bhrtya, kVṣ sa bhūtyām; †aVṣ balat, bVṣ balām, lVṣ vali, jVṣ balavān, kVṣ valākṣi; †bVṣ Chiptaka, aVṣ Sīvika, kVṣ Pulaka, lVṣ Puchaka; †bVṣ hatva-r; †lVṣ Andha, bVṣ Am[ptyam]pra, kVṣ hy Andha, jVṣ Sudhra. Bh says—

hatvā Kānvām* Suśarmāṇam tad-bhrtyo[†] vṣalo bali[†]

gām bhokṣyaty Andhra[†]-jātiyah kañcit ||
 kalam a-sattamah:

where *rBh Kanvām; †kBh tadvatyo; †fBh vṣalo^h (f strictly vṣabhordhalī, cf. p. 25, note⁷); †dBh Andhri, fBh anyā; †cBh kiñcit.

³ This line in Vā, Bd. Bd Kanv°. Vā genly Kanth°: other variations similar to those in p. 34, note¹¹. Bd, Ca²a¹eVā 'yanam; a¹a²bdfgklmVā 'yanān.

⁴ So Ca²a¹eVā, Bd: a¹a¹klVā at-ōd° or at-ōdrtiya; fgmVā ato dhrtya; dVā tat-ōddhrtya (Pkt).

⁵ In jMt °neḥ; bcnMt °nam; lMt °na; gMt °sarmāṇam.

⁶ In a²nMt pragrhya.

⁷ CbdfjMt tām; gMt tām; fMt tvām.

⁸ In eVā Sudharmāṇsam prasahyataḥ

⁹ So Mt; bMt Sumnānām; cknMt sutā°; jMt Aṅgārā.

¹⁰ In eMt c-aiya dṣeṣam; fMt c-aiya sarveṣām.

¹¹ This line is in Vā, not in Bd. Ca¹a²Vā Śrṅ°.

¹² In eVā yac cheṣaḥ; fmVā defective.

¹³ So Mt mostly: dMt kṣayitvā sa; ceMt kṣipitvā sa; lMt jryitvā tu: fgmMt kṣapayitvā, jMt kṣep°, bMt krp°.

¹⁴ In eMt balāyasah; jMt mahīyasām.

¹⁵ CVā kṣayayitvā.

¹⁶ In eVā balī tathā, dVā °tadā.

¹⁷ So Mt genly; dMt °dhrah; jMt °ddhra; nMt °dhra; kMt °va; bMt °yah: dMt Śisurko^o here, Śisukas in next line; eMt Śisruk-Andhraḥ; fgmMt Śikhukas tu; lMt Kimśukrodhaḥ. The correct name is *Simuka* (Rapson, 'Indian Coins, Andhras, &c.' pp. xviii, xli). It was misread as *Śisuka*, and then Sktzd (1) as *Śisuka*, and (2) as *Śisuka* whence *Śikhuka*, by dialectical variation of *ṣ* and *kh*. *Simuka* could be misread as *Śipraka* which Vṣ has, see note².

¹⁸ In kMt sa-jāt°.

¹⁹ So Vā, Bd: eVā Chismako hy a-jātiyah.

²⁰ So CdfjMt, Vā, Bd. Mt genly °vimśa: eVā reads this line—

sa trayo-vimśati rājā bhavitā Chismakaḥ
 samāḥ

²¹ I put the correct name here to combine Mt, Vā, Bd, which read it as above: eMt Śisrukās; cMt Śimśukah.

²² So Mt. Vā, Bd bhavitā tv atha; dVā omits tv; mVā °tv a[rka]tham; gVā bhavitā[s] tathā.

ANDHRAS

39

Kṛṣṇo²³ bhrātā yaviyāms tu²⁴aṣṭādaśa²⁷ bhaviṣyatiŚrī-Śātakarnīr²⁹ bhavitā tasya putras³⁰ tu vai daśa³¹Pūrṇotsaṅgas³² tato³³ rājā varṣāny³⁴ aṣṭādaśaiva tuSkandhastambhis³⁵ tathā³⁶ rājā varṣāny³⁷ aṣṭādaśaiva tupañcāśataṁ³⁸ samāḥ ṣaṭ ca³⁹ Śātakarnīr⁴⁰ bhaviṣyatidaśa cāṣṭau ca⁴¹ varṣāni tasya⁴² Lambodaraḥ⁴³ sutaḥ⁴⁴Āpilako⁴⁵ daśa dve ca⁴⁶ tasya putro bhaviṣyati

10

²³ Mt genly the Pkt nomin. form *Kṛṣṇa*; *jMt Kṛṣṇā*. Vṣ says—*Kṛṣṇa-nāmā tad-bhrātā*. Bh says—

Kṛṣṇa-nām-ātha tad-bhrātā bhavitā prthivī-patiḥ.

See Rapson, *op. cit.*, pp. xix, xlv.

²⁴ In *fgMt ca*.

²⁵ So *a¹a²dgVā*, Bḍ: *eVā Kṛṣṇā*; *bVā kṛṣṇau*: *a²Vā Tvaṣṭro*; *fmVā Tvaṣṭro*; *CjklVā aṣṭau*.

²⁶ So *bdeVā*, Bḍ: *a¹-⁴fgkmVā*, 3 MSS of *CVā bhrātasya*; *lVā*, 2 MSS of *CVā bhrātāś ca*; 1 MS of *CVā smāta-ya*.

²⁷ So all Mt; but *nMt aṣṭām daśa*, see *Introdn. § 40*.

²⁸ So *a²-bdfgkmVā*, Bḍ: *lVā so smā d°*; *eVā so 'ṣṭād°*; *Ca¹jVā tasmād d°*: see *Introdn. § 40*.

²⁹ This name is spelt variously, see p. 37. *Vā* genly *Śātakarnīr*. Bḍ, Vṣ *Śāntakarnīr*. But *bdeMt* *°Mālakarnī*, *nMt* *°kanī* (easy misreadings); *Mt* genly *°Mallakarnī*; *jMt* *°Śālakarnīr*, *kMt* *°parṇī*. Bh *°Śāntakarnā*, *fBh* *°varṇa*.

³⁰ Bh, *lVṣ* agree, *tasya putras*: *fyjMt putrās*.

³¹ So *Mt* genly; *bceknMt samāḥ*. *Vā*, Bḍ *mahān*.

³² This line is only in *Mt*, *eVā*. So *Mt* genly; *fMt Pūrṇotsarga*; *cMt Pūrṇāsāngas*, *eMt* *°sagas*: *eVā* reads this line—

Pūrṇosantu ca varṣāni bhavit-āṣṭādaśa-iva tu.

Vṣ Pūrṇotsaṅga; *jVṣ* *°sam[mṛ]ga*; *hVṣ Pūrṇesaṅga*; *lVṣ Vasukarnnotsaṅga*. Bh *Paurṇamāsa*, and adds *tat-sutaḥ*.

³³ *Tu vai* in *bcenMt*.

³⁴ *Samā* in *nMt*.

³⁵ This line is only in *bdfgnMt*. So *fgMt*; *dMt* *°stabhis*; *bMt* *°Svīrasvanis* (an easy

Kṛṣṇo²⁵ bhrātāśya²⁶ varṣāniso 'smād daśa²³ bhaviṣyati

5

misreading); *nMt Śovastuti*, and inverts him and the next king.

³⁶ *Tapā* in *nMt*.

³⁷ *Samā* in *nMt*.

³⁸ So *Vā*, *CedemnMt*; *jMt* *°satāḥ*. Bḍ, *bfgMt* *°sat tu*; *AklMt* *°sac ca*.

³⁹ *Sat kar* in *eVā*; *eMt* *ṣaḍu*; *nMt* omits *ca*.

⁴⁰ No marked variations in this name: *nMt* inverts him and the preceding king; *mVā* repeating the line reads *tasya putro*. Bh omits him.

⁴¹ *Daśa vāsaiva* in *bMt*.

⁴² In *eVā* [*bhavitā*] *tasmāl*.

⁴³ This line only in *Mt* and *eVā*. Bh and *Vṣ* agree in the name.

⁴⁴ Bh agrees, *tat-putras*: *eVā* *nṛpaḥ*.

⁴⁵ *Mt* genly *Āpītako*; *cgyMt* *Āpīl°*; *eMt* *Āpīl°*; *nMt* *Āpīl°* or *Āpīl°*; *bMt* *†Āryāmtako*: *eVā* *Āpīlako*. But *gVā* *Āpīlavā*; *fVā*, 3 MSS of *CVā* *Āpōl°*; *jVā* *Āpōl°*; 1 MS of *CVā* *Āpāl°*; *mVā* *Ārpāl°* or *Āryāl°*; *a¹-²Vā*, 2 MSS of *CVā* *Āpādaba-*; *bdVā* *Āpīstavā*. Bḍ *Āpōlavo*. *Āpīlaka* seems the best form: the third syll. *ta* in *Mt* names may be a misreading of *la*, and may be read either way in *nMt*. *Vṣ* genly reads *tasmād* before this name, and it was apptly often read as Pkt *tasmā* with the final *d* applied to the name; thus *lVṣ* *Dāpīlaka* (though it interposes *ca*), and *cdekVṣ* (*tasmādivīlakāḥ*) *lvi°* or *Divi°*; hence *afyVṣ* *Divi°*, *CVṣ* *Divi°*: *hVṣ* *Divila*; *jVṣ* *Vilaka*; *bVṣ* *Divānika*. Bh genly (reading *d* in Gupta script as *e*) *Civilaka* or *Cibi°*, *aqBh* *°ika*; *fBh* *Cūibaka*, *dBh* *°bika*; *cBh* *Cibilika*, *Vicilaka*; *rBh* *Vivilaka*, *hBh* *Yi°* or *Ghil°* and *Civil°*. *BBh* *Vikala* apptly.

⁴⁶ So *Mt*; *cenMt tu*. *Vā* genly, Bḍ *dvādaśa vai*, which is equally good: *a¹-²Vā*, 2 MSS of *CVā* *†-ddhodaśa°*.

daśa c-aṣṭau ca varṣāṇi Meghasvātir⁴⁷ bhaviṣyati
 Svātis ca bhavitā⁴⁸ rājā⁴⁹ | Ātir bhaviṣyati nrpo
 samās⁵⁰ tv aṣṭadaśaiva⁵¹ tu | varṣāṇi dvādaśaiva tu⁵²
 Skandasvātis⁵³ tathā rājā | Skandasvātih samās tasmāt
 sapta⁵⁴ aiva tu⁵⁴ bhaviṣyati | sapta⁵⁵ rājyaṁ kariṣyati
 Mrgendraḥ⁵⁶ Svātikarṇas⁵⁷ tu⁵⁸ bhaviṣyati samās trayah⁵⁹ | 15
 Kuntalaḥ⁶⁰ Svātikarṇas⁶¹ tu⁶² bhavit-aṣṭau samā⁶³ nrpah
 eka-samvatsaram⁶⁴ rājā Svātivarṇo⁶⁵ bhaviṣyati
 ṣaṭ-trimśad⁶⁶ eva⁶⁷ varṣāṇi | catur-vimśat⁶⁸ tu varṣāṇi
 Pulomāvir⁶⁹ bhaviṣyati | Pulomāvir⁶⁹ bhaviṣyati
 bhavit-Āriṣṭakarṇas⁷⁰ tu varṣāṇām pañca-vimśatih⁷¹

⁴⁷ This line only in Mt, eVā. So Mt genly; jMt °svāmī; CMt Medhasvātir; nMt Samghasvāpi, an easy misreading; ceMt Saṅghas c-āpi. Vṣ, Bh Meghasvātī, jVṣ Maghas°; kVṣ Meghaghāti. The name has been corrupted in eVā which reads—

daśa c-aṣṭau ca bhavitā so 'ṣṭadaśa bhaviṣyati.

⁴⁸ This line only in Mt: bMt Svātir bhaviṣyate, nMt Svāmī bh°; gMt, in repeating the line, Svāmī bh°: ceMt sa eva bhokṣyate.

⁴⁹ In bMt ramyā

⁵⁰ In cenMt samā: bMt manās, so gMt in repeating.

⁵¹ In cenMt aṣṭau daśa-iva (omitting tu).

⁵² This line is in eVā only. Introdn. § 40.

⁵³ So Mt, mostly. CMt °svātis misprinted as °racātis: cenMt and gMt (in repeating) Skandhasvātis, dMt °svāmī; lMt Skamvastrāṇis (an easy misreading).

⁵⁴ Misread as sam-aiva tva in gMt (repeated), °vaṁ in bMt; cenMt sapta c-aiva.

⁵⁵ This line in eVā only; thus, Skandasvātih samāt tasmā samā, where samā is misreading for sapta.

⁵⁶ This line only in Mt, eVā: bMt Bhagendraḥ; eVā Mahen°; jMt naren°.

⁵⁷ So Mt genly: fgMt °varṇas, but gMt repeats as in text; nMt Sātikarṇas; eVā Sātakarṇis.

⁵⁸ In eMt mu: after this nMt adds by mistake and superfluously varṣāṇi pañca-vimśati (from l. 19).

⁵⁹ In eVā samā-trayam.

⁶⁰ This line only in Mt, eVā: bMt Kuśalaḥ; iMt Ksethulāḥ

⁶¹ In nMt Sātik°; eVā Sātakarṇis.

⁶² Ca in ceMt, and gMt in repeating.

⁶³ In jMt °aṣṭa samo.

⁶⁴ But bcjlnMt °samvatsaro, eMt °se v°, gMt (in repeating) śakasamv°.

⁶⁵ This line only in Mt, eVā. So ACbdIMt: cejMt °karṇo; fgjMt °koṇo, gMt (in repeating) °varṇo; dMt °keṇo; eVā °ṣeno; kMt Syātisenō; nMt Sātikarṇo.

⁶⁶ This line is in Mt, except ACMt: lmMt ṣaḍ-trimśad; gMt (in repeating) ṣaḍ-vimśad; nMt ṣaḍgimśa (= ṣaḍ-vimśa).

⁶⁷ So dmMt and gMt (in repeating): lMt deva; jkMt c-aiva; cenMt tv eva; bfgMt dve ca.

⁶⁸ So Vā, Bḍ: eVā °trimśat.

⁶⁹ This name has been greatly corrupted. So bdklnMt; gMt (in repeating) °vi: ceMt Pulomāvid; jMt Sulomāvir (an easy misreading). In Vā: dgkVā Padumāvir (or, as it may be read in dgVā, Yadu°; and so a°a°lVā and 3 MSS of CVā): then by easy misreadings, bVā Patu° (or Ya°); eVā Patramātir (or Ya°); fVā Ṣaṭumāvir; 4 MSS of CVā Ṣaḍu°; mVā Ṣaṭu° or Ṣadu°; jVā Ṣadrarmāvi; a°Vā and 2 MSS of CVā ṣaṭ samā vai (by attempt at emendment). By regarding the final vi (in Pkt) as an expletive (= vai or api), hjVṣ Padumān or Patu°; abcdegklVṣ Patu°; Bḍ Patumāns ca; other Vṣ Padhumān. Then arBh Vaṭamāna; Bh genly Aṭa°; nBh Aṭha°; mBh Amḍa°; dBh Ara°; sBh Raca°. For this name fmMt substitute (a second) Meghasvātir; and gMt Bhegha°.

⁷⁰ There is great variation in this name

ANDHRAS

41

tataḥ saivatsarān pañca ⁷² Hālo ⁷³ rājā bhaviṣyati	20
pañca Mantalako ⁷⁴ rājā ⁷⁵	pañca Pattalako ⁷⁴ rājā ⁷⁶
bhaviṣyati samā nṛpaḥ ⁷⁷	bhaviṣyati mahābalaḥ ⁷⁸
Purīndraseno ⁷⁹ bhavitā	bhāvyah Purikaṣeṇas ⁸⁰ tu
tasmāt saumyo bhaviṣyati ⁸¹	samāḥ so 'py eka-vimśatim ⁸²
Sundarah ⁸³ Śātakarnis ⁸⁴ tu	Śātakarnir ⁸⁵ varṣam ekam
abdam ⁸⁶ ekam bhaviṣyati	bhaviṣyati narādhipaḥ
Cakorah ⁸⁷ Śātakarnis ⁸⁸ tu ṣaṇ māsān ⁸⁹ vai bhaviṣyati ⁹⁰	

Vā genly *bhavitā Nemikṛṣṇas*; dVā °Nemikṛṣṇas; mMt °Nauvikṛṣṇas; dMt °Nauvik°; jMt °Nārik°; kMt °Saurik°; fgMt °ṣṭauvik°; eMt °Gaurak°; cMt °Gaurakṛṣṇas. ACMT *bhavit-Āriktavarṇas*; bMt °Āriktakarnas; nMt °Āriṣṭakarmā. Vṣ *Āriṣṭakarmā*; so aBh. Bḍ *bhavit-Āniṣṭakarmā*. Bh *Āniṣṭakarmā*. It is impossible to extract the correct name out of this confusion, and I have adopted *Āriṣṭakarmā* as the most central form.

⁷¹ So a'a'a'bdffVā: Vā genly, bMt, Bḍ °tim. Mt *varṣāni . . . tiḥ*; jMt reads this half line, *ṣaṇ-māsān vai bhaviṣyati*.

⁷² So Mt. Vā, Bḍ *saivatsaram pūrṇam*.

⁷³ So all, except lVṣ *Hala*; Bh *Hāleya*; rBh *Hālela* or *Hālena*; cBh *Hālaya*.

⁷⁴ There is great variation in this name. ACbMt *Mandalako*; cMt *Mantalako*; eMt °laniko; lMt *Menulake*; fgknMt *Maṇḍalako*; dMt *Maṇḍako*; nMt *Kuṇḍalako*. Then kVṣ *Pantalaka* or *Patl°*; Vṣ genly *Patl°*; lVṣ *Pitt°*; deVṣ *Putt°*; jVṣ *Pakṣal°*; aVṣ *Prabhul°* (or *Prattal°*?). Bḍ *Pattallaka*. Bh, losing the first syll., *Talaka* (see Appendix II, § vi); aBh *Tanaka*; hBh *Halaka*; dBh *Śūt°*. Vā, by losing the third syllable, *Saptaka*; fVā *Saptaṁka*; bḍVā *Masaka* (misreading of *Maptaka*?). eVā reads this half line, *pañc-aivabhā . . . ko rājā*. *Mantalaka* or *Pattalaka* seems the most likely form, from which the other readings might have been derived by misreadings. Bh says, *tasya c-ātmajah*.

⁷⁵ So Mt, eVā: bMt *rākṣo*.

⁷⁶ Vā, to compensate for the lost syllable in *Saptaka*, and by the meaning of *sapta*, reads *rājāno* and turns the two following words into plurals: nVā *rānā[man]ho*. Bḍ *nāma*. The correct reading must be *rājā*.

⁷⁷ So Mt, eVā, where *nṛpaḥ* is redundant, cf. line 26.

⁷⁸ So Bḍ. Vā °ṣyanti *mahābalaḥ*.

⁷⁹ This line is in Mt. So Mt genly; CMT °seno or °seni; nMt *Purīndraseno* and *Purīdra°*; bMt *Purāṇa°*: kVṣ *Pulindrasana* (for °drasena); abkVṣ °dasena; lVṣ *Pullas°*; Vṣ genly, eVā *Pravillas°*; deVṣ *Pravilas°*; jMt *Pravilis°*; where *pra* may be a misreading of *pu*.

⁸⁰ This line is in Vā, Bḍ. So a'-fjlmVā; bḍVā *Purīkasenas*; kVā *Purīkāṣanas*; jVā *Purīkheṇus*; CVā *Putrikasenas*. Then dBh *Purīkasenu* (where *s* and *h* are much alike); arsBh °bheru; eghjklmnpqBh °bhoru; other Bh, Bḍ °bhīru. These variations suggest the name *Puruṣasena*. A king *Purīsadata* of the *Ikhākus* is mentioned, see p. 37.

⁸¹ So Mt genly: bMt *sāmyo°*; nMt *saimyo°*, °yau°; dMt *seno°*. *Saumyo* cannot well be a king, though the line says so on its face, because in this dynasty two kings are never put together in a single line without any mention of their reigns. *Saumyo bhaviṣyati* is probably a corruption, see Appendix II, § iii.

⁸² So Ca'fjkmVā, Bḍ; a'a'a'bdhlVā °tiḥ; gVā °ti: eVā reads this half line *samā dvādaśa bhū-tale*.

⁸³ This line is in Mt, eVā. Vṣ *Sundara*: fgMt *Sundharah*. Bh, lVṣ *Sunandana*.

⁸⁴ Usual variations, see p. 37.

⁸⁵ So Vā, Bḍ, with variations, but no personal name: 1 MS of CVā *Śāntakirttir*.

⁸⁶ In eVā *varṣam*; jMt . . . tam.

⁸⁷ So Mt genly, eVā. Vā genly *Cakāra*. Vṣ, Bh *Cakora*; gpBh *Cakara*; kVṣ *Cā[kā]-kāra*. But ceMt *Rājāda*; nMt *rājā vai*: bMt reads this half line *rājā vaṁśyo vikarnas ca*: lVṣ merely *Śātakarni*.

G

aṣṭā-vimśati ⁹¹ varṣāṇi Śivasvātir ⁹² bhaviṣyati 25
 rājā ca Gautamīputra ⁹³ eka-vimśat tato ⁹⁴ nṛpaḥ ⁹⁵
 aṣṭā-vimśaḥ ⁹⁶ sutas ⁹⁷ tasya Pulomā vai ⁹⁸ bhaviṣyati
 [ek-ōna-trimśatim bhāvyaḥ Śātakarṇis tattho nṛpaḥ] ⁹⁹
 Śivaśrīr ¹ vai Pulomā tu ² sapt-aiva ³ bhavitā nṛpaḥ ⁴
 Śivaskandhaḥ ⁵ Śātakarṇir ⁶ bhavitāsy-ātmajaḥ samāḥ ⁷ 30
 nava-vimśati ⁸ varṣāṇi ek-ōna-vimśatim ⁹ rājā
 Yajñaśrīḥ ¹⁰ Śātakarṇikah ¹¹ Yajñaśrīḥ ¹² Śātakarṇy atha ¹³

⁸⁸ So Vā, cdefgjnMt, Vś, with variations. Mt genly Svātīkarnas. Instead of this name Bh genly vaṭako yatra; rBh vaṭtikā; nBh (and BBh?) navamo; jBh cavako altered to vaṭako; GgBh bahavo; dBh baṭako (or ṣaṭako) yasya. Read vaṭuko yasya?

⁸⁹ In bdeMt māso; eVā ṣaṭ samān.

⁹⁰ So Mt. Vā genly vai narādhipaḥ; eVā bhavitā nṛpaḥ; kVā v[ta] narādhipaḥ.

⁹¹ So Mt, bmVā, Bđ. Vā genly, jMt °vinśat tu

⁹² So Mt, dVā, Bđ. Vś, Bh agree: lVś 'svātīḥ; aVś Śivaḥ Svātīḥ; fgMt Śikhasvātīr; tBh Śiras; jMt Śiraḥs. Ca'djVā Śiva-svāmī; a²-bfghkVā °svāmīr; mVā °svāmīr. Bh calls him arindamaḥ.

⁹³ In bcMt, bVś Gotamīp°. Vś, Bh Gomatīp°; lVś Gomatī. Mt adds hy.

⁹⁴ So dfjMt, a²Vā; cnMt °vinśa°. AmMt eka-vimśaty ato; CMt aka-v° by misprint: bMt, a²a²bdfghklmVā eka-vimśattamo; CjVā, Bđ °vinśat samā. Eka-vimśattamo, '21st king', can hardly be right, because he is not 21st in any list except AMt where two preceding kings are omitted; and he can only be made 21st by omissions.

⁹⁵ So Mt, bdfghlmVā, Bđ, though it is redundant. AjkVā nṛsu.

⁹⁶ This line only in Mt: dgMt °sa; bjMt °sat; CMt °sati.

⁹⁷ In nMt tutas; jMt tatas; bMt samas.

⁹⁸ ObMt Sulomā vai; but beMt Pulomā tu in next line. Vś Pulimān; lVś Puḥ; aVś Kuḥ. Bh Purimān; kBh Puri; fBh Putrī. The name should no doubt be Pulomāvir. Vś adds, tat-putraḥ.

⁹⁹ This line only in eVā: see p. 37.

¹ This line only in Mt, eVā. So Mt genly: ceMt °śrī; nMt °śvā; bMt Sivasir; jMt

Śirogrīvaḥ (omitting vai). Vś Śātakarṇi Śivaśrīḥ; lVś makes this two kings, tasya-āpi Śātakarṇiḥ tatas Śivaśrīḥ (see p. 37): dBh Sacasirā; nBh Midasirāḥ; Bh genly Medas; kBh Medās; fBh Medas. This half line in eVā is, Śiraśi putra Aṅis tu.

² So Mt genly; cMt °māḥ tu; bgMt °māsu. But jMt °māt tu; CMt Sulomāt tu.

³ In bMt samaiva; eVā catasro.

⁴ In eVā samāḥ.

⁵ This line only in Mt, eVā. So Mt genly. Vś, afmnrBh agree: cBh °skadhra: dfjMt, Bh genly, hVś °skandhaḥ (altered in sBh to °skandha); bVś °svanda; kVś °sunda: jMt Śiraskandho, eVā °skandhaḥ.

⁶ So cdefgmnMt, eVā; bMt Sāmak°. ACIMt Śātikarṇād; kMt Śalaihkarṇikā; jMt Nṛpaskando.

⁷ So cdejnMt; bMt defective vin-asy°; fgMt bhāvī tasy°. ACKlmMt bhavitā hy āt°: eVā bhaviṣyati samā nṛpaḥ. No number is mentioned. Perhaps Mt should read, bhāvī tasmāt trayo samāḥ (see Appendix I, § iii), and eVā bhaviṣyati samās trayah.

⁸ So Mt: jMt °vinśat tu; fgMt °śivāt tu: beclnMt read this line—

nava varṣāṇi Yajñaśrīḥ * kurute† Śātakarṇikah†.

where *bMt °śnīḥ; †bMt kurune, nMt kusate; †ceMt °karninā, lMt Sātavarṇitā, bMt Śaṣsakarṇikah.

⁹ So Vā, Bđ: bdghVā °trimsatam; kVā trikonatrisatam.

¹⁰ Mat genly Yajñaśrīḥ; dIMt °śrī; jMt Yajñah Śrī-.

¹¹ In kMt Śātakarṇinā.

¹² So Ca²ejVā; mVā Yajñah Śrīḥ. Bđ Yajñah Śrī-: a¹a²abfglVā Yajuhśrī-h; dhkVā Yajuhśrī-h. Vś, Bh Yajñaśrīḥ with

ANDHRAS

43

ṣaḍ eva¹⁴ bhavitā¹⁵ tasmād¹⁶ Vijayas¹⁷ tu samā nrpaḥ¹⁸
 Caṇḍasrīḥ¹⁹ Śātakarṇis²⁰ tu²¹

tasya putraḥ samā daśa

Pulomāviḥ²⁴ samāḥ sapta²⁵ anyas teṣām²⁶ bhaviṣyati
 ek-ōna-vimśatir hy ete²⁷

Āndhrā²⁹ bhokṣyanti vai mahīm
 teṣām varṣa-śātāni syuṣ
 catvāri ṣaṣṭir³² eva ca.

Daṇḍasrīḥ²² Śātakarṇi ca

tasya putraḥ samās trayah²³

ity ete vai nrpās trimśad²⁸

Andhrā³⁰ bhokṣyanti ye³¹ mahīm
 samāḥ śātāni catvāri

pañca ṣaḍ vai tath-aiva ca³³.

marg. alteration °sāra in aBh; sBh °śīla,
 altered to °śrī: kVṣ *Suṅgaśrīs*. Bh adds
tat-sutas.

¹³ In eVā °api: 2 MSS of CVā *Sāmakarṇy*
atha.

¹⁴ In eVā etc.

¹⁵ In jMt *naciḍā* (misreading of *bhavitā* in
 old Bengali script?).

¹⁶ In *bcen*Mt *yasmād*; eVā *vastu*.

¹⁷ So all: but *de*Vṣ *Vijaya*; bMt, jVṣ
Vijas; eVā *dvijah yaśu* (omitting *tu*); bVṣ
Dvijajña; lBh *Vinaya*. Bh says, *tat-suto*.

¹⁸ So Vā, Bd. Mt genly *samās tataḥ*;
*bcn*Mt *samam*°; fgjMt [sa] *samā daśa*.

¹⁹ So Mt genly; cMt *Caḍasrīḥ*; egMt
Vaṇḍa°; bMt *Candratīḥ*. Vṣ genly *Candra-*
śrīḥ; cVṣ *Cadra*°: dBh *Candraśija*, frBh
°vija, asBh *°vīrya*, Bh genly *°vijñāḥ*.

²⁰ Mt genly *Śāntikarṇas*, with variations;
 bgMt *Śāmakarṇis*.

²¹ So Mt, eVā. Vā, Bd *ca*.

²² So Vā. Bd *Daṇḍa-Śrī*.

²³ In eVā *samās trayam*; aVā *samāstrayah*.

²⁴ So eVā, aVṣ; lVṣ *°māvi*. Bd *°māriḥ*.
 Vṣ genly *°māciḥ*; cdefjkVṣ *°mārciḥ*; hVṣ
°mādi; bVṣ *Anulomāviḥ*. Bh genly *Salom-*
madhiḥ; mBh *Sul*°; kBh *Mal*° (all easy
 misreadings).

²⁵ Mt genly *Pulomā sapta varṣāni*; CbdmMt
Sul°; where the last syll. of the name has
 been probably regarded as a particle and
 ousted by the change of Pkt *varṣa* to Skt
varṣāni. Vā genly *Pulov-āpi*.

²⁶ So Mt, Vā genly: eMt *antyes*°, nMt
antas°, cMt *amnyas*°; all mistakes for *antyas*
teṣām, probably the true reading, cf. p. 12,
 l. 22; p. 18, note 7. Ca'fVā *tanyesām ca*
 (f omits *ca*). Bd *tataś c-aīṣām*; eVā *san*
tasmād.

²⁷ So Mt, genly: fgMt *°śati*°; dMt *°śatis*
c-ēte; jMt *°śad ete ca*; nMt *ek-ōnā-naratiḥ*
hy ete, ceMt *°ekānā-n*°.

²⁸ So Vā, Bd: mVā omits this line.

²⁹ So Mt genly: cfjnMt *Andhrā*; dMt
Andhrām; bMt *nrpā*.

³⁰ In eVā *akṣā*.

³¹ So Vā. Bd, gVā *var*.

³² So Mt: nMt *ṣaṣṭir*, bMt *ṣaṣṭim*: jMt
 reads this line—

dvādaś-ādhikam eteṣām rājyam śata-
catuṣṭayam.

³³ This line is in Vā, Bd: not in mVā.
 So Vā genly: hVā *pañca ṣaḍ va*°: bdfgkVā
°ṣaṭ ca°; eVā *°ṣaṭ sapta c-aīva hi*. Bd
pañcāśat ṣaṭ tath-aiva ca. Vṣ says—

evam ete trimśat catvāry abda-śātāni*
ṣaṭ-pañcāśad -ādhikāni prthivīm bhokṣyanti*:
 where *kVṣ omits *trimśat*; *hVṣ *aṣṭa*; *lVṣ
ṣaś pañcā[da]śad. Bh says—

ete trimśan nrpatayaś catvāry abda-*
śātāni ca

ṣaṭ pañcāśac ca prthivīm bhokṣyanti,
Kuru-nandana:

where *aBh has *vimśan* written above;
 gBh *aṣṭa*.

VARIOUS LOCAL DYNASTIES

Various Local Dynasties.

Text—AMt 273, 17^b–24 ; AVā 99, 358^b–365 ; Bḍ iii, 74, 171–179^a.

Corresp. passages—CV§ iv, 24, 13–16 ; GBh xii, 1, 29–32^b.

The account of these dynasties consists of three parts, the first of which summarizes the number of kings in each dynasty and the second states its duration, while the third adds certain subsequent kings. In the first part the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmanḍa agree generally, but in the second the Matsya has one version and the two others another. Here the dynastic matter in the Matsya ends, and the third part is found only in the two others. The Bhāgavata gives the first part in verses which are much like the texts of those Purāṇas, only the concluding portion of the second, and a very brief notice of the third. In the first part therefore the two versions are printed side by side. In the second part the Matsya version and that of the Vāyu and Brahmanḍa are compared side by side, but in the third there is only the text common to those two. The Bhāgavata statements in both these parts are given in the notes. The Viṣṇu in prose agrees closely with the Bhāgavata.

The Vā and Bḍ mention the dynasties in the second part in the same order that all three Purāṇas observe in the first part, but the Mt verses are disarranged in the second part, and are re-arranged here in that order for convenience. This involves no tampering with its text, because each line is complete in itself and independent, except ll. 12, 13 which compose a couplet forming verse 22 and which remain undisturbed ; hence the Mt verses are placed here thus, 23^b, 24^a, 20^b, 21^b, 20^a, 21^a, 22^{ab}, 23^a, 24^b.

The Mt is generally complete ; but eMt omits ll. 12–14 ; fMt l. 8 ; gMt repeats ll. 3, 4 after l. 10 ; kMt omits ll. 4, 5 ; lpMt have nothing. ACVā omit ll. 7, 8, but AVā mentions them in a note ; most other copies give them ; a⁴Vā omits ll. 7 (second half)–9 (first half) ; mVā ll. 1–3, but they are added in the margin. Of Bh versions j omits ll. 1–5, but they are added in the margin ; bt have nothing.

These local dynasties are all classed together as more or less contemporaneous. The number of years assigned to them must be considered according to the remarks in Introdn. §§ 42 ff., and with reference to the middle of the 3rd century A.D. when the account was first compiled as preserved in the Mt, for the revised versions in Vā and Bḍ did not revise the periods¹. If those remarks be sound, the Śrīparvatīya Andhrabhṛtyas had at that time reigned 52 years, or (if we read *dviḥ pañcāsatam*) possibly 100 roundly, according to Mt ; while the Vā and Bḍ reading is no doubt corrupt and should perhaps be 112 or 102 years. The Abhīras had then reigned 67 years, the Gardabhilas 72 years, the Śakas 183 years, the Yavanas 87 or 82 years, and the Tusāras 7,900 or 500 according to the proper construction of the sentences but perhaps 107 or 105 is really meant. The 13 Gurundas or Murundas had then reigned half of the quadruple of 100 years, that is 200, according to Mt, or 350 according to Vā and Bḍ, but the latter is probably a corruption of the former

¹ Except in l. 6, if Mt reading *dvi-pañcā-* | to *daśa dve ca satam ca vai* ; see Introdn. *satam* is right, and if we emend Vā and Bḍ | § 41.

VARIOUS LOCAL DYNASTIES

45

reading, for Vś and Bh say precisely 199 years. The 11 Hūnas or Maunas had then lasted 103 years.

Mention of these races is found in the inscriptions; thus Ābhīras in Lüders' List of Brāhmī Inscriptions, nos. 963, 1137 (Epig. Ind. x, Appendix) and Fleet's Gupta Inscriptions, p. 14; Sakas, Lüders' list, nos. 1123, 1135, 1137, 1148, 1149, 1162, and perhaps 1001-2, and FGI p. 14; Yavanas, Lüders' list, nos. 669, 965, 1093, 1123, 1140, 1154, 1156; Murundas in FGI, p. 14, and Murundadevi, *id.*, pp. 128, 132, 138; Hūnas, FGI, pp. 56, 148, 206. A Vākātaka prince Vindhyaśakti is mentioned in Kielhorn's Inscriptions of Northern India, no. 622 (Epig. Ind. v, Appendix).

Mt, Vā, Bd.

- Andhrāṇām¹ samsthite rājye²
tesām bhrty-ānvayā³ nṛpāḥ⁴
(i) sapt-aiv-Āndhrā⁵ bhaviṣyanti
(ii) daś-Ābhīrās⁷ tathā nṛpāḥ⁸
(iii) sapta Gardabhinaś⁹ cāpi
(iv) Śakās cāstādaśaiva tu¹²
(v) Yavanāḥ¹⁶ bhaviṣyanti
(vi) Tuṣārās¹⁸ tu¹⁹ caturdaśa

Bh (with Vś).

Sapt-Ābhīrā Āndhrabhṛtyā⁵

daśa¹⁰ Gardabhino¹¹ nṛpāḥ
Śakāḥ¹³ ṣoḍaśa¹⁴ bhūpālā
bhaviṣyanty ati-lolupāḥ¹⁵
tato 'ṣtau Yavanā¹⁷ bhāvyaś
caturdaśa ca Tuṣkarāḥ²⁰

Turiskah

¹ So *cd* fm Mt, Vā, Bd. Mt genly *Āndh*°; jMt *sandh*°: *eVā Arthānām*.

² So *cdefgkn* Mt; jMt *sāsthite*°; bMt *saṁsthite*°; other Mt *saṁsthītā*°: *eVā saṁsthite vaṁse*. Vā, Bd *saṁsthītāḥ pañca*; so mVā (defective).

³ So *dfgk* Mt, *eVā*; lMt *-atrayā*; jMt *†dady-ānvayā*. Mt genly *bhrty-ānvaye*: bMt *-adyaso*. But fmVā *vaṁśāḥ svayāḥ* (for *vaṁś-ānvayāḥ*?), Vā genly *°samāḥ*. Bd *vaṁśyās ca ye*.

⁴ So Mt: fmVā *punāḥ*. Vā, Bd *punāḥ*.

⁵ Bh genly *Āvabhṛtyā*; eBh *Av*°; aBh *c-Āv*°; fBh *Āvabhṛthyā*. Vś rightly *Andhra-bhrtyāḥ sapt-Ābhīrā*; lVś *Āndh*°.

⁶ So Mt; *eVā sapta c-Āndhrā*. Vā, Bd *sapt-aiva tu*; hVā *°nu*.

⁷ So Mt, Vā, genly, Bd: *dVā °Ābhārās*; *eVā dār-Ābhīrās*, dMt *var*°; jMt *var-Ābhīrā*; bMt *nāv-Āmīrās*; lMt *naiv-Ābhīrā*: mMt, *klVā* defective; fgMt *Ābhīrās ca*.

⁸ So Mt mostly: Vā, Bd *tato*°: dnMt *nṛpās tathā*, eMt *bhrtās*°, cMt *mṛtās*°, fgMt *vṛśās*°: jMt *nṛpās tadā*.

⁹ So Vā, bcknMt, Bd: eMt *Mard*°, but

when repeated *Gardabhīlās* as in Mt genly: lMt *Kardabhīlā*; jMt *Gatabhṛtās*.

¹⁰ Vś agrees.

¹¹ So Bh genly, *alVś*: *lVś °nā*; pBh *Garbhattino*. Vś genly *Gardabhīlāḥ bhūbhujā*, *hVś °bhikā*°: qBh *†daśarddagabhīno*; jVś, eBh *crp*.

¹² So Mt genly; jMt *Śakāsāst*°: bMt *Śakās c-aiva daś*°, cenMt *Śākyaś*°, but eMt in repeating reads as in text: lMt *†Kōśaiva daś*°. But *eVā tath-āstādaśa vai Śakāḥ*; Vā, Bd *tato 'tha daś*°: *klVā* has *Thakāḥ*.

¹³ So Vś. Bh *Kāṅkāḥ*; eBh *Kān*°.

¹⁴ Vś agrees.

¹⁵ So Bh mostly: *cefjklng* Bh *ca lol*°; hBh *na lol*°.

¹⁶ By double sandhi (= *Yavanāḥ aṣṭau*); fmVā *Yāv*°: fgMt *Yavanāḥ ca*. This half line is in jMt *aṣṭau tu Yavanā dhīrās*, in *eVā tath-aiva Yavanā aṣṭau*.

¹⁷ Vś agrees: jBh *Javanā*.

¹⁸ In jMt *Tuḥkhārās*; eMt *Tuṣāgās*.

¹⁹ So Vā, eMt, Bd. Mt *ca*; jMt omits.

²⁰ So *Baeghjlnpq* Bh: *asBh °Tuḥkhārāḥ*, rBh *°Tuṣārāḥ*, nBh and v.r. in *GBh °Puṣka*

VARIOUS LOCAL DYNASTIES

Mt, Vā, Bḍ.

(vii) trayodaśa {Gurundās²¹
{Murundās} ca
(viii) {Hūnā²⁴ hy ek-ōṇa-vimśatiḥ²⁵.}
(ix) {Maunā²⁴ hy ekādaśaiva tu²⁶.}

Mat.

Āndhrāḥ²⁹ Śrīparvatīyās³⁰ ca
te dvi-pañcāśataḥ³² samāḥ
sapta-śaṣṭis³⁵ tu varṣāni³⁶
daś-Ābhirās³⁸ tathāiva ca³⁹
sapta Gardabhilā⁴¹ bhūyo⁴²
bhokṣyantīmām vasundharām⁴⁵
śatāni trīṇy aśitīm ca⁴⁷
Śakā hy⁴⁹ aṣṭādaśa⁵⁰ aiva tu

sāḥ. GbktBh Turuṣkakāḥ, cBh^okarāḥ. CVś
catrudaśa Tukhārāḥ, bdeghjVś^oTuśārā
aVś^oTukhārā, lVś^oKharā.

²¹ Both forms are well supported. Mt
genly, Bḍ Gurundās; nMt Gar^o. Vā genly,
jMt Mar^o; jVā, mMt Mur^o; fVā Mer^o.
Others, fgMt Pur^o; cḍMt Purañdās; eMt
Purañjās: 4 MSS of CVā Manañtās, which
ACVā adopt; eVā Rañdās with tu for ca.
Gurunda occurs in Bhaviṣya iii, 5, 32, where
it is said Vraja-bhāṣā, Mahārāṣṭri, Yāvanī,
and Gurundikā are the four Mleccha bhāṣās.
For Murunda see p. 45. Cf. notes ⁶⁵, ⁶⁶.

²² So Vś, dfgmBh and v.r. in GBh. Bh
genly bhūyo daśa, an easy misreading; jVś
omits.

²³ So Bh genly; dBh Sur^o: aBh Surāñdās,
sBh Subā^o. Vś Muñdās, prob. error for
Murundās, which lVś has.

²⁴ Both names are well supported. Mt
genly Hūnā; jMt Hūnā; lMt Janā; eVā
Yanū; Vā, Bḍ, bMt Maunā: nMt smṛtā.
See note ⁷².

²⁵ So Mt; dMt c-ēk^o: cMt omit hy.

²⁶ So eVā, Bḍ. Vā hy aṣṭādaś.

²⁷ So Bh, Vś: hBh Monā; aBh Maulā.

²⁸ Vś agrees.

²⁹ In gMt An^o; dfMt Andhā: jMt yukṭā;
bMt reads this half line Andhākṣāḥ par-
vatīyās ca.

³⁰ So cdfjykmnMt; lMt omits Śrī. ACMt

Bh (with Vś).

trayodaśa²² Gurundās²³ caMaunā²⁷ ekādaśaiva²⁸ tu. 5

Vā, Bḍ.

Andhrā³¹ bhokṣyanti vasudhām
śate³³ dve ca śataḥ³⁴ ca vai
sapta-śaṣṭim ca varṣāni³⁷
daś-Ābhirās tato⁴⁰ nṛpāḥ
sapta Gardabhinaś⁴³ cāiva⁴⁴
bhokṣyantiīmām dvi-saptatiḥ⁴⁶
śatāni trīṇy aśitīm ca⁴⁸
bhokṣyanti⁵¹ vasudhām Śakāḥ

Śrīpār^o; eMt^oparvatīyās.

³¹ In eVā Randhrā.

³² So ACbhlMt: cefgmMt te dve pañca
śataḥ, dMt dve pañca ca śataḥ: jMt ta dve
pañca daś-āpi ca for this half line.

³³ In fmVā śataḥ; kVā śato. Read pro-
bably daśa; see Introdn. § 41.

³⁴ In kVā dva ca^o; eVā dve 'rdha-śataś.

³⁵ In ceMt^oti; nMt^oti.

³⁶ In cenMt sahasrāṇi.

³⁷ This line is in a¹⁻³bdefghklmVā, Bḍ;
first half in a¹Vā, sapta-śaṣṭi śatāni-īha.
Not in ACjVā, but mentioned in note to
AVā: a¹⁻³blVā^ośaṣṭi^o; eVā tu for ca.

³⁸ In fmVā daśabhirās, jMt^obhā...s: kMt
Darbharomā.

³⁹ In beenMt tatas tu vai.

⁴⁰ In eVā tatho.

⁴¹ In beenMt^obhino; jMt^obhrto

⁴² But better beenMt bhūpā.

⁴³ This line is in a¹⁻³bdefghklmVā, Bḍ. Not
in ACjVā, but in note to AVā

⁴⁴ In ekVā c-āpi.

⁴⁵ Sic: read dvi-saptatim?

⁴⁶ In eVā, Bḍ^otim.

⁴⁷ In bgjMt aśitīs ca; cenMt trīṇi ca tathā.

⁴⁸ In bdgVā^oaśitīs ca; fmVā trīṇi 'śitīs
ca; eVā trīṇi varṣāṇām: a¹Vā omits this
half line, see note ³⁷.

⁴⁹ Mt genly śatāny, jMt tathā hy, no
doubt corruptions of Śakā hy, and I have

VARIOUS LOCAL DYNASTIES

47

Mat.

Yavanāṣṭau bhaviṣyanti⁵²
 sapt-āṣitim⁵⁴ mahīm imām
 sapta varṣa⁵⁵-sahasrāṇi⁵⁶
 Tuṣārānāḥ⁵⁸ mahī smṛtā
 śatāny ardha⁶⁰-catuṣkāni⁶¹
 bhavitavyās⁶² trayodaśa⁶³
 Gurundā⁶⁵ Vṛsalaiḥ⁶⁶ sārddham⁶⁷
 bhokṣyante⁶⁹ Mlecchā⁷⁰-sambhavāḥ⁷¹
 śatāni trīṇi bhokṣyante⁷³
 Hūnā hy⁷⁴ ekādaśaiva tu⁷⁵

Vā, Bḍ.

asīti dve ca⁶³ varṣāṇi
 bhoktāro Yavanā mahīm 10
 pañca varṣa-śatānīha⁵⁷
 Tuṣārāṇām⁵⁹ mahī smṛtā
 śatāny ardha-caturthāni
 bhavitāras trayodaśa⁶⁴
 Murundā⁶⁸ Vṛsalaiḥ⁶⁶ sārddham
 bhāvya-ānyā⁷² Mlecchā-jātayaḥ
 śatāni trīṇi bhokṣyante⁷³
 Maunā⁷⁶ ekādaśaiva tu⁷⁷

emended it so: *bclnMt* †*nava*; *eMt* †*naca*.
⁵⁰ So *Mt* genly: *bclnMt* *c-āṣṭau*°; *lMt* *v-āṣṭau*°; *jMt* *Andhā*°.

⁵¹ In *a¹⁻³defgmVā* °*te*.

⁵² Sic: better *ca bhokṣyanti*.

⁵³ So *bclVā*; *a²glVā* *āṣṭim*°: *mVā* *āṣṭi*°; *dVā*, *Bḍ* *āṣṭi*°; *fVā* *āṣṭir*°. *Ca'a²a⁴ckVā* *āṣṭim* *c-aiva*.

⁵⁴ So *AlmMt*; *CbMt* °*ti*: but *cemMt* *saṃ-āṣṭi-m*, *dMt* °*āṣṭim*; see *Introdn.* § 40. Others, *gMt* *saṃśāsyanti*; *fMt* *saṃśās*°; *kMt* *saṃśās*°; *jMt* *praśās*° (see p. 16, note⁷⁸).

⁵⁵ In *bMt* *varṣasyātu*; *lMt* *varṣāṇām* (one syll. short).

⁵⁶ So all *Mt*: read *śatānīha*?

⁵⁷ In *eVā* *śatānīkaṃ*

⁵⁸ In *jMt* *Tuḥkhār*°.

⁵⁹ In *eVā* *Tuṣārāṇām* *tu*.

⁶⁰ *CcMt* °*ardham*: *bMt* *śatam ardha*-; *kMt* *śat-ardha*-.

⁶¹ In *bclnMt* *caturthāni*.

⁶² In *eMt* °*vyam*; *jMt* *samaṃtās* *ca*.

⁶³ In *mMt* *trayo nṛpāḥ*; *bnMt* *caturdaśa*. This line and the next go together.

⁶⁴ See note⁵². This line and the next go together.

⁶⁵ *ACbMt* *Gurundā*; *nMt* *Gar*°; *gMt* *Kur*°; *mMt* *Mur*°; *fMt* *Muc*°; *lMt* *Puru*-[*śā*]ndā; *ckMt* *Purudā*; *dMt* *Su*[*dvi*]rūndā; *jMt* *Sudundā*.

⁶⁶ In *nMt* *drś*°; *ejVā* *prś*°; *blMt* *vṛṣabhāiḥ*.

⁶⁷ In *cMt* *sarvair*.

⁶⁸ *Bḍ*, *ghklVā* *Gurundā*; *a²dḥmVā* *Mur*°; *Ca'a²bVā* *Mar*°; *a⁴Vā* *Pur*°; *jVā* *Munujā*;

eVā *Aṣandā*. Regarding these *Vṣ* says—
 ete prthivīm trayodaśa* varṣa-śatāni
 nava¹-navaty-adhikāni bhokṣyanti:
 where * this means the 13 Gurundas, and so
lVṣ ete trayodaśa prthivīm; yet it has affected
 śatāni: but *dVṣ* ete prthivīm *Abhīr-ālyā*
Maun-āntā *ek-ōn-āṣṭir* *āntā* [sic] *soḍaśa*:
 'kVṣ *śata-varṣāṇi*: 'dhjVṣ omit *nava*. *Bh*,
 in consequence of the misreading *bhūyo*
daśa (see note²²), says 10, and applies it
 wrongly to the period instead of to the
 kings—

ete bhokṣyanti prthivīm daśa varṣa-śatāni
 ca

nav-ādhikām ca navatim °.

where * *cBh* omits this half line.

⁶⁹ In *fgMt* *ślaukṣyante*.

⁷⁰ In *lMt* *murū*; *jMt* *vṛṣa*.

⁷¹ In *fgMt* *saṃyuvāḥ*; *cMt* *jātayaḥ*; *lMt* *jantavaḥ*.

⁷² So *AflmVā* by double sandhi for *bhāvyaḥ*
anyāḥ: *jVā* *bhāvya-ānnā*; *gVā* °*ānye*; *bhVā*
 °*ārtya*; *dVā* *bhāvyaś te*; *kVā* *bhāvya*[*nye*]
te, showing influence of both readings: *eVā*
tath-ānye. *Bḍ* *bhokṣyante*.

⁷³ In *bclnMt*, *Ca'Vā*, °*ti*.

⁷⁴ All *Mt* *varṣāṇy* with no name: no doubt
 a corruption of *Hūnā hy* (see l. 5), and I
 have emended it so.

⁷⁵ In *bMt* *†ekādaśāni* *ca*; *fgMt* *aṣṭādaśa*
aiva tu: see l. 5.

⁷⁶ So *Bḍ*, see l. 5: *eVā* *Yavunās* *tr*. *Vā*
 genly *Mlecchā*. *CVā* *Sneccā* by misprint

⁷⁷ *Vṣ* says—*tataś ca Paurā** *ekādaśa* *bha*-
patayo 'bda'-śatāni trīṇi mahīm bhokṣyanti:

Mat.

teṣṭsanneṣu⁷⁸ kālena⁷⁹
tataḥ Kilakilā nrpāḥ⁸¹.

Vā. Bḍ.

tac-channena ca⁸⁰ kālena⁷⁹
tataḥ Kolikilā vrsāḥ⁸².

15

Vā and Bḍ.

tataḥ Kolikilebhyas⁸³ ca Vindhyaśaktir⁸⁴ bhaviṣyati
samāḥ ṣaṇ-ṇavatiḥ⁸⁵ jñātvā⁸⁶ prthivīm tu⁸⁷ sameṣyati⁸⁸.

Dynasties of Vidiśā, &c.

Text—Mt nil; AVā 99, 366–372; Bḍ iii, 74, 179^b–185.

Corresp. passages—CVṣ iv, 24, 17; GBh xii. 1, 32^b, 33.

The Vāyu gives the whole, and the Brahmāṇḍa all except line 7. The Viṣṇu is concise but not clear, and the Bhāgavata has only three obscure lines: they mention no names except where stated in the notes. Among MSS *a*²*fm* Vā omit l. 7; *e* Vā l. 11; *k* Vā and *l* Bh have nothing.

There are references to the people of Vidiśā, Vediśa, in Kielhorn's 'Inscriptions of Northern India' (Epig. Ind. v, Appendix), namely, Sāñchi inscriptions, nos. 187–524 *passim*; Bharaut inscriptions, nos. 712–885 *passim*. For Vindhyaśakti see p. 45; and as regards Pravira, a successor of Vindhyaśakti, named Pravarasena, is mentioned with his five successors, *op. cit.*, no. 622. As regards Nakhavān, king

where **h*Vṣ *Maunā*, *k*Vṣ *Paurava*; **h*Vṣ *aṣṭa*. Bh says—

Maunā * *ekādaśa* kṣitim

bhokṣyanty abda¹-śatāny aṅga¹ trīṇi:
where **a*Bh *Maunā*, *c*Bh omits this half
line; **g*Bh *aṣṭa*; **h*Bh *aṁtra*, altered in
*d*Bh by later hand to *śatān pañca*; *f*Bh
omits this line.

⁷⁸ So Mt genly; *b*Mt *†naiṣu chatreṣu*:
*cdj*Mt *teṣ-ūtpanneṣu*; *g*Mt *teṣ-ūcchinneṣu*;
*f*Mt *teṣu cch*^o: *k*Mt *teṣ-ūtsaveṣu*.

⁷⁹ In *bcd**efyn* Mt *kāleṣu*; *e*Vā *sarveṣu*.

⁸⁰ So Vā genly; *d*Vā *†tachāsanāś ca*; *e*Vā
teṣ-ūtsanneṣu. Bḍ *teṣu cchinneṣu*.

⁸¹ So Mt, *e*Vā: *l*Mt *Kilak*^o; *fg*Mt *Kilik*^o:
*d*Mt *Kilakalā*, *jm*Mt *kilau*.

⁸² So Vā genly; *b*Vā *Koḷiḷākikā*^o, but
Kolikilebhyas in next line. Bḍ *Kilakilo*
nrpāḥ. Vṣ says (*h*Vṣ omits)—

teṣu channeṣu * *Kailakilā*[†] Yavanā bhū-
patayo bhaviṣyanti:

where **d*eVṣ *cchinneṣu*, *b*Vṣ *putreṣu*, *j*Vṣ

kṣetreṣu, *fgk*Vṣ *teṣ-ūcchanneṣu*, *l*Vṣ^o *ūtsan-
neṣu*; *bl*Vṣ add *punaḥ*, *k*Vṣ *purah*: **ak*Vṣ
Kelik^o, *l*Vṣ *Kaikilā*, *b*Vṣ *Kaiśilānā*. Bh
says—

taiḥ samsthite * tataḥ

Kilikilāyām[†] nrpatayo:
where **e*Bh *†taiḥ*, *g*Bh *†tam*, *f*Bh omits this
line: **aps*Bh *Kilak*^o, *em*Bh *Kalik*^o, *l*Bh
Kalimk^o, *hj*Bh *Kimlimk*^o, *f*Bh *Kinkilāyām*.

⁸³ So Vā: *e*Vā *Kel*^o; Bḍ *Kilak*^o: *k*Vā
Pholikolabhyas.

⁸⁴ Vṣ agrees,—*mūrdh*^{*}-*ābhiṣiktas teṣām*
Vindhyaśaktiḥ[†]: where **l*Vṣ *a-mūrdh*^o;
*l*Vṣ *Vinda*^o. Bh omits.

⁸⁵ In *b*Vā *samā yayāvati*; *k*Vā *samān*
parṇamatiḥ.

⁸⁶ In *e*Vā *bhūtvā*. Bḍ *c-aiva*.

⁸⁷ So *d**fg**hkm*Vā, Bḍ; *b*Vā *nu*. Vā genly *ca*.

⁸⁸ But 2 MSS of CVā *sa bhokṣyati*; *k*Vā
merely *saḥ*, but adds *moḭāmpānnām* (for
Maunānām?) *samāpti*: *e*Vā reads this half
line *prthivī tu gamiṣyati*.

DYNASTIES OF VIDISĀ, ETC.

49

Nahapāna (see note ¹¹) is mentioned, *id.* nos. 1099, 1131-5, 1174; Purikā in nos. 782, 812, 837-9, and JRAS, 1910, p. 445. Bhogin may perhaps bear some allusion to Bhogavardhana, nos. 264, 266, 373, 572, 797. For Nahapāna see JRAS, 1910, p. 820; 1912, p. 785.

(Nrpān¹ Vaidisakāmś² cāpi³ bhaviṣyāms tu⁴ nibodhata
 Śeṣasya Nāga-rājasya putraḥ para-purañ-jayah⁵
 Bhogī⁶ bhaviṣyate rājā⁷ nrpo Nāga⁸-kul-ōdvahah⁹
 Sadācandras⁹ tu Candramśo¹⁰ dvitiyo Nakhavāms tathā¹¹
 Dhanadharmā¹² tatas¹³ cāpi caturtho¹³ Vaṅgarah¹⁴ smṛtaḥ
 Bhūtinandas¹⁵ tatas¹⁶ cāpi Vaidise tu¹⁶ bhaviṣyati
 Suṅgānām¹⁷ tu kulasyānte¹⁸ Śisunandī¹⁹ bhaviṣyati
 tasya bhrātā²⁰ yaviyāms tu namnā Nandiyasāḥ²¹ kila
 tasyānvaye bhaviṣyanti²² rājānas te trayas²³ tu vai
 dauhitrah²⁴ Śisuko²⁵ nāma Purikāyām²⁶ nrpo 'bhavat²⁷

king of Vaidisa

शिव नागराज

मोक्षी भोगी

चन्द्राक्ष-सद्विन्द

5

जागदीहि

दामरि

कोर

भुविन्द

1

10

¹ So B_d, a¹⁻³bdefghVā and 1 MS of CVā: other Vā *vṛṣān*.

² Vaidisik^o in eVā; a¹Vā Vaidesik^o: gVā ca disak^o.

³ B_d c-ātha; eVā c-aiva.

⁴ So bdfhVā, B_d, mVā crp. Vā genly ca.

⁵ So a¹a²bdeghlVā, 2 MSS of CVā: other Vā *svara-pur^o*. B_d *surā-pur^o*. V_s *tataḥ Purañjayaḥ*, i.e., after Vindhyaśakti: lV_s *tataḥ parām Pur^o*; abhV_s *Para-pur^o*: hV_s *Purānpur^o*.

⁶ In eVā *śyati nrpo*, a³Vā *tato*.

⁷ In bdlVā *Nāma*.

⁸ This half line in eVā is *Nāga-loka-samudbhavaḥ*.

⁹ In a¹Vā *putraś C^o*: eVā *Dāmadhandras*. V_s *Rāmacandra*; bhV_s *Vāma^o*.

¹⁰ So Vā genly. B_d *āmśur*; jVā *āso*; eVā *ābho*: dVā *Vaṇdāmśo*.

¹¹ In bdlVā *tataḥ*; gVā *tu saḥ*: eVā *Nakhapāna-jah* (see above), which may be the true reading.

¹² In eVā *Vakhampita*. V_s *Dharmah*; lV_s *Dharmavarmā*.

¹³ In bghjVā *the*; dVā *tham* or *tho*.

¹⁴ Vā genly *Vimśajah*; jVā *vimśah bhūmī* (with excess syll.). B_d, lVā *vimśajah*: eVā, cV_s *Vaṅgavaḥ*: bfgjV_s *Vaṅgara*; lV_s *garā*; aV_s *gāra*; dBh *gari*; rBh *gira*; Bh genly *giri*; aBh *kiri*: mBh (misreading *v* as *tr*) *Trāṅgiri*, eBh (Va) *Tuṅgiri*; cBh *Bhr̥ṅgiri*:

hV_s *Vagara*; kBh *Vāgiri*. V_s genly *Vārāṅga*: kV_s *Urddara* (or *Dur^o*). *Vaṅgara* seems the most central form.

¹⁵ So Vā, B_d: eVā *Bhūmī^o*. Bh genly *Bhūtananda* (inverting him and *Vaṅgara*), lV_s *nandi*, pBh *manda*: qBh *Bhr̥thananda*: kV_s *Kṛtanandi*, V_s genly *nandana*.

¹⁶ So B_d. Vā genly *vai deśe tu* (bVā *nu*): a³Vā *vamśe sa tu*; eVā *vaiśogaiśo* or *vaiśig^o*.

¹⁷ So a¹a²a³ghlVā: eVā *Sūnkā^o*; bdlVā *Śrṅgā^o*. Vā genly *Angā^o* (see p. 32, note ⁴).

¹⁸ So eVā. Vā genly *nakulasyānte*: CjVā *nandanasy^o*, which dVā adopts.

¹⁹ So eVā; akV_s, Bh agree: cV_s *Śusi^o*; gV_s *Śusir^o*. V_s genly *Suśi^o*; lV_s *Suśu^o*; bhV_s *Sukhi^o*. Vā *Madhu^o*.

²⁰ So bhklV_s, Bh, *tad-bhrātā*.

²¹ So Vā, B_d, V_s genly: fmVā *Mandiy^o*; dV_s *Nandriy^o*; hV_s *Randiy^o*; bV_s [Ra] *Nandiy^o*: jV_s *Nandipāsāḥ*. Bh *Yāsonandi*; kBh *Yāśi^o*.

²² In eVā *tasyānvavāye bhavitā*.

²³ In mVā *taṁ trayas*; bdlVā *tatra yas*; hVā *tan-nayas*.

²⁴ In bdlVā *dauhitryaḥ*: CVā *dohitrah*, fVā *daih^o*.

²⁵ So Vā; V_s agrees. B_d *Śisiko*; jV_s *Śibhuka*; kV_s *Śusika*; lV_s *Śukra*.

²⁶ So Vā genly: dVā *kāyā*, eVā *kāyo*. B_d *Purikāyām*; gVā *Ripuk^o*: see above.

²⁷ In dVā *bhavet*.

H

50 DYNASTIES OF THE THIRD CENTURY, A.D.

Vindhyaśakti²⁸-sutaś cāpi Pravīro²⁹ nāma vīryavān³⁰
 bhokṣyate³¹ ca samāḥ śaṣṭim³² purīm Kāñcanakām ca vai³³
 yakṣyate³⁴ vājapeyaś³⁵ ca samāpta-vara³⁶-daksinaih.
 tasya putrāś tu³⁷ catvāro bhaviṣyanti narādhipāḥ³⁸.
 branches. 9) V

Dynasties of the Third Century, A.D.

Text—Mt nil ; AVā 99, 373-382^a ; Bḍ iii, 74, 186-193.

Corresp. passages—CVś iv, 24, 17, 18 ; GBh xii, 1, 34-37^b.

The Vāyu gives the whole, and the Brahmanḍa all except the last three lines. The Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata are condensed and not clear ; but they are fuller about Viśvasphūrjī, and the Bhāgavata version is placed on the right side by side with the Vāyu and Brahmanḍa version in ll. 10-14.

Among MSS a²fmVā want ll. 17-19 ; eVā gives ll. 1-10, then inserts the last part of the *Early Contemporary Dynasties* (p. 23), all the Nandas, Mauryas, Śuṅgas, Kāṇvāyanas and the first 12 lines of the Andhras, by reason of a large displacement, and then gives ll. 12-19 here, omitting l. 11 : kVā and bBh have nothing.

Bāhlikas are mentioned in Fleet's *Gupta Inscriptions*, p. 141 ; Puṣyamitras, *id.* p. 55 ; Māhiṣatī (= Māhiṣmatī), pp. 375, 497-8, 501, and JRAS, 1910, pp. 444, 867. For other geographical information my Translation of the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa (Index) may be consulted.

Vindhyaśakti¹ kule 'tite² nrpā vai Bāhlikāś³ trayah⁴

Supratiko⁵ Nabhīraś⁶ ca⁷ samā bhokṣyanti⁸ trimsatim⁹

²⁸ Vindhīś in gVā ; see p. 45

²⁹ So Vā, Bḍ. Vś says *Śisuka-Pravīrau* ca ; lVś *Śukra-Pravīraś* ca. Bh merely *Pravīrakah*. See p. 48.

³⁰ Vś adds—ete * varṣa-śatam śaḍ¹ varṣāṇi bhaviṣyanti :

where * lVś *etasmād* ; ¹ lVś *śaṣṭi pañca*. Bh says—

ity ete vai¹ varṣa-śatam bhaviṣyanti adhi-
kāni śaḥ :

where ¹ cBh *ity evaṁ te* [ya], arBh *bhokṣyanti* ete, v.r. in GBh *yuktā ete*.

³¹ So bdfghmVā, Bḍ. Vā genly *bhokṣyanti*, eVā °te, which may apply to Śisuka and Pravīra ; plural instead of dual, cf. next dynasties, l. 2.

³² In bdfghVā *śaṣṭih*.

³³ In bdmVā *purī* ; mVā ends *nau* : eVā *Pulakāṁś Calakāṁś ca vai*.

³⁴ So Bḍ. CVā °ti. Vā genly *yakṣyante*,

a¹jVā °ti. The sing. is clearly right, but see note ³¹.

³⁵ In eVā *vājimedhaiś*.

³⁶ In eVā *samāpte bahu-*.

³⁷ In eVā ca ; see p. 48.

³⁸ In eVā *su-mūrtayaḥ*. Vś *tataḥ tat-putrāḥ trayodaś-aiva* (lVś =aite). Bh *teṣāṁ trayodaśa sutāḥ*.

¹ In eVā *Karmakānāṁ*.

² So Vā genly : fVā *kulānānte* ; mVā *kulānā-tena*. Bḍ *kulānānte*, Pkt for *kulānām ante*.

³ So CeghmVā. Bh, lVś agree : kBh *Vah*°. Vś genly *Bāhlikāś* : cjlBh *Bāhlikāḥ* ; dkVś *Vāhlikāḥ*. AbdlVā *Vāhnikāś* ; fVā *Vāhri*° ; Bḍ *Vāhi*° : kBh *Vāhni*°.

⁴ Vś agrees.

⁵ In hVā °iāko ; dVā *Suprako*.

DYNASTIES OF THE THIRD CENTURY, A.D.

51

VVM

Śakyamānābhavad¹⁰ rājā Mahiṣinām¹¹ mahī-patiḥ
 Puṣyamitra¹² bhaviṣyanti Paṭumitrās¹³ trayodaśa¹⁴
 Mekalāyām¹⁵ nṛpāḥ sapta¹⁶ bhaviṣyanti-īha saptatim¹⁷
 Kośalāyām¹⁸ tu¹⁹ rājāno bhaviṣyanti mahābalāḥ²⁰
 Meghā iti²¹ samākhyātā²² buddhimanto nav-aiva tu
 Naisadhāḥ²³ pāṛthivāḥ sarve bhaviṣyanti ā-Manu-kṣayāt²⁴
 Nala-varṇsa-prasūtās te vīryavanto mahābalāḥ²⁵

⁶ In *bdVā Nabhāras* (altered in *d* to *Na-bhā*); *eVā Nnaratīras*. *Bd Gabhāras*.

⁷ So *bdefyhmVā*, *Ed*. Other *Vā tu*.

⁸ *CVā*, *Bd bhokṣyati*.

⁹ So *Ca* *jVā*, *Bd*: *a²-fymVā °tiḥ*; *bdhVā °tiḥ* (altered in *d* to *vimṣatiḥ*): *eVā vimṣa-tim*.

¹⁰ In *a¹-jVā* and 3 MSS of *CVā Śakyamānābhavad*: other MSS divide it into two. For first part, *flmVā Śakyamānā*, *ghVā Śakyā°*, *dVā Śakyā°*, *bVā Śikyā°*; 3 MSS of *CVā Śakyamānā*; *eVā Sākṣonāmān*: *Bd Śaikamāno*. For second part, *Bd*, *eVā bhavad*; *ghlmVā* and 3 MSS of *CVā bhavo*; *bVā bhavi*; *fVā savo* or *tavo*; *dVā vīya*. From all these variations I have adopted *Śakyamānābhavad*.

¹¹ *Bd*, *a¹Vā* and 3 MSS of *CVā Māh°*; *IVā Mahiṣ°*; *eVā Mahiṣyānām*.

¹² *Vā* genly, *Pd Puṣpa°*; *a¹Vā Putra°*: *eVā Puṇḍramindrā*.

¹³ *Ca* *IVā Paṭta°*; *a³Vā Paṭu°*; *gVā Paṭu°* or *Padu°*; *hVā Yadu°*; *a¹Vā Puṭa°*; *bVā Pada°*; *fmVā Saṭu°*; *eVā Padumindrās*. *Bd* *ṣaṭ Strimitrās*. Others short, *dVā Yāmitrās*, *a¹Vā ṣaṇ m°*, *jVā Sadamīs*. *Paṭu-mitrās* seems the most central form.

¹⁴ In *gVā tath-aiva ca*. *Vṣ* says—

tataḥ* Puṣpamitra¹-Paṭumitrās¹ trayo-daśa¹:

where **bVṣ* adds *castrayaḥ*; **IVṣ Puṣya°*, *aVṣ Puṣā°*; **klVṣ Paṭa°*, *bjVṣ Yadu°*, *hVṣ Paṭu°*, *aVṣ Paṭumitr-ādyās*, *CVṣ Padhumitra-Padmamitrās*; **hVṣ sarva-varṇeṣu balavān jayo bhaviṣyati trayodaśa*, as if *trayodaśa* belongs to the following words. *Bh* says—

Puṣpamitra* 'tha rājanyo Durmitro¹ 'sya¹ tath-aiva ca:

where **dfBh Puṣya°*; **dBh Damitro*; **ahBh 'tha*.

¹⁵ In *gVā Mekalāyā*, *bdVā Mik°*; *hVā Mikalāyā*.

¹⁶ *Vṣ* says—Mekalās* *ca sapta¹ Kośalāyām¹ tu nav-aiva¹ bhūpatayo bhaviṣyanti*: where **dVṣ Mekalyās*, *hVṣ Mekalāḥ*; **IVṣ sapt-Āndhrāḥ*, *hVṣ Āndhra*, *kVṣ Ātra*, and *hklVṣ* add *tataḥ ca*; **IVṣ sapta Kauśalāḥ*; **IVṣ nava*, *hVṣ tath-aiva*, *kVṣ tayeṇa*. *Bh* says, agreeing with some of these readings—

eka-kālā ime bhūpāḥ* sapt-Āndhrāḥ¹ sapta Kauśalāḥ¹:

where **dBh bhūmeḥ*; **cmBh Āmbhrāḥ*, *kBh Āmprā*; **arsBh Koṣ°*, *fBh Kaus°*, *dBh Koṣ°*. Cf. *eka-kālā* here with the error *Mekakālāḥ* in *hVṣ*.

¹⁷ So *eVā*; *Bd °syanti ca saptatiḥ*. But *a¹-bdghlVā °syanti-iti santatiḥ*; *fmVā °syanti santatiḥ* (short); *CjVā °syanti ca sattamāḥ*, and *CVā* mentions *santatiḥ*.

¹⁸ So *eVā*; *dVā Koṣ°*. *Vṣ*, *Bh* agree, see note¹⁹. *Vā* genly, *Bd Kom°*.

¹⁹ *Ca* in *eVā*.

²⁰ In *gVā narādhipāḥ*.

²¹ In *hVā Medyā*; *eVā* either; *a¹Vā Medhā-tiḥ*.

²² In *eVā °khyāto*.

²³ *Vṣ* says—Naisadhās* *tu tāvanta¹ eva¹ bhūpatayo bhaviṣyanti*:

where **kVṣ Śaiṣarās*; **IVṣ tata*; **hklVṣ* stop here: *hVṣ* omits the whole. *Bh* says—

Vaidūra* *patayo bhāvyā Naisadhās¹ tata eva hi*:

where **cjBh Vaidūrya*, *GBh Vidūra*; **GBh Nisadhās*. See p. 50.

²⁴ In *eVā °syanti manvṣyayāt*.

²⁵ In *gVā mahāyaśāḥ*, *Pkt* plural.

Maḡadhānām ²⁶ maha-vīryo
Viśvasphānir ²⁸ bhaviṣyati
 utsādyā pāṛthivān sarvān
 so 'nyān varṇān ³¹ kariṣyati
Kaivartān ³³ Pañcakāṁś ³⁴ cāiva
Pulindān brāhmaṇāms tathā
 sthāpayiṣyati ³⁷ rājāno ³⁸
 nānā ⁴¹-deśeṣu te janā ⁴²
Viśvasphānir ⁴³ mahā-sattvo
 yuddhe Viṣṇu-samo balī ⁴⁸
Viśvasphānir ⁵⁰ nara-patiḥ klīv-ākṛtir ivocyate ⁵¹

Maḡadhānām tu ²⁷ bhavitā
Viśvasphūrjīh ²⁹ purañ-jayah ³⁰ 10
 kariṣyaty aparān ³² varṇān
Pulinda-Yadū ³⁵-Madrakān ³⁶
 prajāś cābrahma ³⁹-bhūyiṣṭhāḥ ⁴⁰
 sthāpayiṣyati ⁴³ durmatīḥ ⁴⁴
 vīryavān ksatram ⁴⁶ utsādyā ⁴⁷
 Padmavatyām ⁴⁹ sa vai puri

²⁶ In *bd fghmVā* *Maḡ°*; *eVā* *Maḡadhāyān*.

²⁷ In *adBh* *ca*.

²⁸ So *a°a°fghmVā*, *Bd*. *Vā* genly *°sphānir* here, but *°sphānir* in l. 14; *bhVā* *°sphānir*; *eVā* *°sphācir*; *jVā* *Viṣyaphānī*.

²⁹ So *Bh* genly: *gBh* *°sphūrjīh*; *rBh* *°sphūrjīh*; *ahBh* *°sphūrtti*; *cBh* *°skurtīh*; *nBh* *Viśva[va]sphārjī*. *Vś* says—

Maḡadhāyām * *Viśvasphāṭika-saṅjño* 'nyān varṇān kariṣyati:

where **acfyjhkVś* *Maḡ°*.

³⁰ In *dBh* *paran-tapaḥ*.

³¹ Defective in *dVā*, *pāṛthivān sāsvarṇān*, altered to *pāṛthivān so va kīrṇān*.

³² So *dekmpgsBh*; *GafBh* *aparo*: *ghjlnrBh* *°ti paro*; *cBh* *°ti puro*. For *Vś* see note ²⁹.

³³ In *hVā* *°varttyān*; *fVā* *°vallyān*.

³⁴ So *Vā*; *jVā* *Nāñ°*. *Bd* *Madrakāṁś*: *eVā* *Yapumāṁś* (or *Papu°*).

³⁵ In *cBh* *Yadra*; *kBh* *Yadru* (or *Padru*): *hBh* *Pulindāyaru*.

³⁶ *Vś* says—*Kaivarta-Yadu**-*Pulinda-brāhmaṇān*† *rājye* *sthāpayiṣyaty* *utsādyā-ākhilā*† *ksatra-jātim*:

where **bhVś* *Yadu* or *Padu*, *gVś* *Yadu* or *Patu*, *deVś* *Patu*, *hVś* *Paṭṭā*, *lVś* *Vatuh*, *aVś* *Kaṭu*, *CVś* *Kadhū*: † *CafVś* *brāhmaṇyān*, *bVś* *Pulindābrāhmaṇān*: † *kVś* *uchādyoṣeṣa*.

³⁷ So *eVā*. *Vā* genly, *Bd* *°syanti*. The sing. is required by the sense and is corroborated by *Vś* and *Bh*; the plural is prob. a mistake through misunderstanding *rājāno*.
³⁸ So *Vā*, *Bd*: *eVā* *rājā tu*. Hence *rājāno* is obviously not a nomin., but the Pkt accus. plural and = *rājñāḥ* (see Pischel's

Prakrit Grammar, § 399), because *Viśvasphānī* had, as said above, overthrown all kings and it was he who created these miscellaneous kings. *Rājāno* should have been Sanskritized as *rājñāḥ* with some expletive for the lost syllable, but was mistaken for the nomin. and so remained unchanged.

³⁹ *C-adharma* in *dBh*.

⁴⁰ *Bhūmiṣṭhā* in *aBh*.

⁴¹ *Nānā* wanting in *eVā*.

⁴² So *bdhjVā* (altered in *d* to *°janāḥ*). Here *te janā* are obviously not the nomin. but the Pkt accus. plural and = *tān janān* (Pischel's *Prakrit Grammar*, §§ 363, 425), because they refer to the *Kaivartas*, &c. Not being fully understood they appear Sanskritized as *te janān* in *Bd*; while they were mistaken for the nomin. and were Sanskritized as *te janāḥ* in *a°-dfghmVā*. *CeVā* read *tejasā* (an attempted emendation?) which *AVā* adopts.

⁴³ But *gBh* *°syanti*.

⁴⁴ *Bhūpatiḥ* in *fBh*.

⁴⁵ *Vimvasphāṭir* in *eVā*.

⁴⁶ *Kṣetram* in *aBh*; *dBh* *akrm*.

⁴⁷ But *asBh* *utsārya*; *fBh* *utpātya*.

⁴⁸ *Bd* *°sama-prabhah*; *fjVā* *°prabho*; *mVā* *°prabhā*. After this line *dVā* inserts—*Viśvasphāṭi* *Kaivartyanām* *Chakāṁś* *c= iva* *Pulindakān*.

⁴⁹ *Padmāv°* in *cBh*: see p. 53, notes ¹, ².

⁵⁰ So *Bd*, *bVā*. *Vā* genly *°sphānir*; *eVā* *°sphāṭir*.

⁵¹ So *Vā* genly, *Bd*; *a°Vā* *ih-ocyate*; *eVā* *ath-ocyate*: *gVā* *†klīvāvikṛtiocyate*; *hVā* *†klī-*

CONTEMPORARY DYNASTIES OF EARLY FOURTH CENT. 53

utsādayitvā kṣatram tu ⁵² kṣatram anyat kariṣyati
devān pitṛiṁś ca viprāṁś ca tarpayitvā sakṛt punaḥ ⁵³
Jāhnavī-tiram āsādyā ⁵⁴ śarīram yaṁsyate ⁵⁵ balī
sannyasya ⁵⁶ sva-śarīram tu ⁵⁷ Śakra-lokam gamiṣyati.

Contemporary Dynasties of the Early Fourth Century

Text—Mt nil; AVā 99, 382^b–388^a; Bḍ iii, 74, 194–200^a.

Corresp. passages—CVs iv, 24, 18; GBh xii, 1, 37^c–40.

The Vāyu and Brahmanḍa give the whole of this passage except ll. 12–15. The Viṣṇu gives the whole fully in prose. The Bhāgavata has ll. 3, 4 (condensed into one) and 12–17, and agrees closely with the Viṣṇu. Ll. 12–15 are taken from it and placed on the right, to supplement the account given by the Vāyu and Brahmanḍa; and they appear to be old ślokaś because they agree closely with the older prose account of the Viṣṇu. Among MSS eVā has only ll. 1–6; kVā and b/Bh have nothing.

As regards Naiṣadhas and Kosalas see p. 51; and for other peoples and countries my translation of the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa may be consulted.

(Nava Nākās¹ tu bhokṣyanti purim Campāvatim² nṛpāḥ
Mathurām ca purim ramyām Nāgā³ bhokṣyanti sapta vai⁴
anu-Gaṅgā⁵ Prayāgaṁ ca Sāketam⁶ Magadhāṁś⁷ tathā
etān janapadān sarvān bhokṣyante Gupta-varṁśa-jāḥ⁸)

vāttatirorācyate; bVā +klivāmratirācyate
(short); dVā klivāsantotir ucyate.

⁵² Uccādayitvā tat kṣatram in eVā: see note ³⁶.

⁵³ Satsut punaḥ in hVā; bVā sasat^o; dVā sat^o; eVā yathākramam.

⁵⁴ But dVā Jāhnavī-tīre prāsādyā.

⁵⁵ Vā genly yaṁsyate: a³Vā nyasate; eVā nyasya vai; dVā yāsyu, altered to yasma-jveta; gVā tyakṣate: tyakṣyate is suggested in CVā but it anticipates the next line. Yaṁsyate seems the best emendation.

⁵⁶ So Vā genly: bVā sa ny^o; hVā samy^o; gVā sa y^o; eVā niḥkṣipya: lVā reads this half line sasya sva-śarīram rūpaṁ.

⁵⁷ In hVā nu.

¹ So Vā. Bḍ Nāgās; eVā Rāndhās.

² Padmāvatim in eVā: see l. 8. This line

and the next refer to different cities and dynasties, but Vś, reading Nāgas in both, condenses the two lines and the preceding mention of Padmavatī (p. 52, l. 14) into one statement---

nava Nāgāḥ Padmāvatyām* Kāntipurām* Mathurāyām*:

where *lVś Padmav^o nāma puryam, jVś Pasāṁvanyām; cVś Kāntip^o, a³kVś Kāntāp^o, bhVś Kāntyām; *hVś Medhurāyām. Bh nil.

³ But dVā Nākā; hVā Nāmā; bVā Nānā; eVā Yaunā.

⁴ In bVā sapta vi; dVā saptatim.

⁵ So a¹-bdefghlmVā, Bḍ. CjVā °Gaṅgam.

⁶ So a³dVā, Bḍ. CbfglmVā °tum; a¹a²a³lVā °tu; eVā Sāketa.

⁷ In bVā Madhyagās; eVā Makhaḡās.

⁸ So Vā genly: eVā Gupā^o; bVā Guhya^o. Bḍ sapta; lVā Maṇḍhānya-jāḥ Vś says—

सर्वगाः

54 CONTEMPORARY DYNASTIES OF EARLY FOURTH CENT.

Naiṣadhān⁹ Yadukāmś¹⁰ c̣aiva Śaiśītān¹¹ Kālatoyakān¹²
 etān janapadān sarvān bhokṣyante¹³ Maṇidhānya-jāh¹⁴
 Kośalāmś¹⁵ c̣a Āndhra-Paundrāmś¹⁶ ca Tāmraliptān¹⁷ (sa-sāgarān¹⁸
 Campām c̣aiva¹⁹) purīm ramyām bhokṣyante¹⁰ (Devarakṣitāh²⁰)
 Kalingā Mahiśās c̣aiva Mahendra-nilayās ca ye²¹
 etān janapadān sarvān pālayiṣyati vai Guhāh²²
 Strīrāṣṭram²³ Bhokṣyakāmś²⁴ c̣aiva bhokṣyate Kanak-āhvayaḥ²⁵
 Saurāṣṭr-Āvanti-Ābhīrās²⁶ ca
 Śūdrā²⁷ Arbuda-Mālavāh²⁸

anu-Gaṅgā Prayāgam Māgadhā* Guptās[†]
 ca[†] bhokṣyanti:

where *hlVś Māgadhān, kVś Māgadhā, jVś
 Māgadhā Suhmā; †lVś Guptāmś, aVś omits
 Guptās ca; † here bVś adds Māgadhān, klVś
 Māgadhā. Bh. says—

anu-Gaṅgām ā-Prayāgam guptām* bho-
 kṣyati[†] medinim[†]:

where *fBh goptā; †hjBh bhokṣyanti cor-
 rectly; fBh vai mahīm.

⁹ Naiṣadhān in Ca²djVā.

¹⁰ In dghVā Yadukāmś or Pud^o; eVā
 Yadumāmś.

¹¹ In bdVā Śaiśītān; gVā Śaiśikān; eVā
 Śaiśikān; hVā Sauśītān.

¹² AVā °topakān (misreading y as p).

¹³ Ca²jVā bhokṣyanti.

¹⁴ So Vā; mVā °ja; Bd °jān: eVā Mā'a-
 dhānyagah. Vś similarly—

Naiśada*-Naimiśika*-Kālatoyān[†] janapa-
 dān[†] Maṇidhāra*-vaṁśā bhokṣyanti[†]:

where *bhIVś Naiśadha, kVś Śaiśara (see
 p. 51, note ²³); †hVś Naimika; †abhVś
 °yakān, lVś °yakā; †lVś °padā; †kVś °dhā-
 raka, deVś °dhāna, lVś °dhānya, aVś
 °dhānāka, bVś °dhānavaka, cVś °dhā, hVś
 Manadhanyaka; †acfkVś vaṁśyā^o, lVś
 vaṁśo bhokṣyati. Bh, jVś omit this.

¹⁵ In fVā Kos^o; dgVā Kośalās; bhVā
 Chośalās.

¹⁶ So ClVā, Bd: a²a²jVā Pau^o; dVā
 Poṇḍās; a²Vā Pāṇḍyās: hVā c̣a Ādhra-
 Podrās, bVā °Poṭās: mVā c̣a Ādha-Pau-
 drāmś, fVā °Paundrās: gVā c̣a Anupādās.

¹⁷ In fmVā Tāmā^o: dVā Tāmralipt-ānu-
 sāgarān, bghVā Tāmā^o, lVā Nāmā^o.

¹⁸ In bhVā [Pam]Campām cica; dVā
 Paṁcupāṁci.

¹⁹ Ca²a²fjVā °syanti; hVā °syate.

²⁰ So a²a²glmVā; bdVā Daiva^o. Ca²a²fjVā
 Devarakṣitām, hVā Daira^o. Vś similarly—
 Kośal*-Audra*-Pundraka*-Tāmraliptān[†]
 samudratata-purīm[†] ca Devarakṣito rakṣi-
 syati[†]:

where *hVś Kośalam, cgVś Koyāl-, lVś
 Kaulpa; †hVś Udra, jVś Ēdra, kVś Ōtra,
 lVś Loddhra; †lVś Pundra, bcVś Pudraka,
 wanting only in dejVś; †acgjkIVś Tāmā^o;
 †lVś rakṣati. Bh nil.

²¹ In gVā tathā.

²² Vś similarly—

Kaliṅga*-Mahiśika*-Mahendrabhaumā[†]
 Guhām[†] bhokṣyanti:

where *bVś puts nakṣatra before Kaliṅga;
 †defjkVś °śaka, lVś °śa, hVś Māheya-Kaccha;
 †hVś °drān^o, lVś °drabhaumān correctly,
 jkVś °drabhaumān; †bIVś Guhā correctly,
 jVś Guhān, hVś omits. Bh nil.

²³ So Ca²jVā; Bd °stra: a²a²bdgjhlmVā
 Strīrājyam. AVā Srī by misprint.

²⁴ So bdfhmVā; gVā Bhokhya^o; lVā Bho-
 kṣa^o; ACjVā Bhakṣya^o: Bd Bhoja^o.

²⁵ In jVā °ahvaye. Vś says—

Strīrāja*-Trairāja*-Mūśika*-janapadān
 Kanak-āhvayā bhokṣyanti[†]:
 where *aIVś omit; †so CgkVś, but bhIVś,
 °rājya, aVś Tepirājya, cfVś omit; †cVś
 Mūśivā, hVś Mūkhika, lVś Muṣita, akVś
 Mṛśika; †lVś °āsvayo bhokṣyati. Bh, dejVś
 omit this.

²⁶ So Bh. Vś similarly—

Saurāṣṭr-Āvanti*-Śūdrān[†] Arbuda-Maru-
 bhūmi*-viśayāmś ca vrāty-ādvij[†]-Ābhīra[†]-
 śūdr-ādyā bhokṣyanti:

where *hVś Surāṣṭr-Āvaśca; †fVś Śūdra,
 abVś Śūdr-(aVś Śūr)-Ābhīrān, hVś Bhadr-
 Ābhīrā, kVś Sur-Ābhīr-Ārb^o; †hVś °bhū,
 bVś Maru, kVś Merabhūmi; †or vrātyā
 dvij-, bhVś vrātya dvij-, aVś vrajñe^o, kVś

EVILS OF THE KALI AGE

55

culya³⁴-kālam bhaviṣyanti
sarve hy ete mahikṣitaḥ
alpa-prasādā hy anṛtā³⁸
mahā-krodhā hy adhārmikāḥ.

vrāty-ādvijā²⁹ bhaviṣyanti.
śūdra-prāyā janādhipāḥ
Sindhos tatam Candrabhāgām³⁰
Kauntīm³¹ Kāśmīra-maṇḍalam
bhokṣyanti śūdrā vrāty-ādyā³²
Mlecchāś ca ābrahma³³-varcasah¹⁵
tulya-kālā ime³⁵ rājan
Mleccha³⁶-prāyās ca bhūbhṛtaḥ³⁷
ete³⁹ 'dharm-ānṛta-parāḥ⁴⁰
phalgu-dās tīvra-manyavaḥ.

Evils of the Kali Age.

Text—AMt 273, 25-34 ; AVā 99, 388^b-412 ; Bḍ iii, 74, 200^b-224.

Corresp. passages—CVṣ iv, 24, 18-29 ; GBh xii, 1, 41-2, 23.

After having thus brought the dynasties down to the early part of the 4th century A.D., these Purāṇas launch out into a prophetic description of the future evils of the Kali age, and the Vāyu and Brahmānda deal with them at great length. It is unnecessary to set out these passages, because they merely embody gloomy brahmanic forecasts, which were no doubt based on actual calamities, but which have (no historic value except in so far as they may portray, more or less really, miseries which the country underwent in lawless times. But the first portion of the description appears to depict the unsettled condition of the country in the early part of the 4th century, and this alone is presented here. The references for it are—AMt 273, 25, 26^a ; AVā 99, 388^b-393^a ; Bḍ. iii, 74, 200^b-203 ; CVṣ iv, 24, 18, 19 ;

rājye 'bhikṣikt- ; || jVṣ Ā[ti]bhūra, aVṣ Ātira.
But IVṣ has only Saurāṣṭrā ; deVṣ nil.

²⁷ So Bh, except GcrBh Śūrā.

²⁸ In fBh Abhyuda-Pālavāḥ.

²⁹ Or vrātyā dvijā.

³⁰ So Bh. Vṣ similarly (IVṣ omits)—

Sindhutaṭa-Dārvikorvī*-Candrabhāgā-
Kāśmīra[†]-viṣayān[†] vrātyā[†] Mlecch^{||}-ādayaḥ
śūdrā bhokṣyanti :

where * fVṣ Dārvikorvī, cVṣ °kovī, jVṣ °kevi,
gVṣ °kocām ; aVṣ Dāvikorvī, kVṣ Davi°,
bVṣ Deva° ; hVṣ Davakorthā : ' kVṣ Rāsmīva :
† fhjkVṣ viṣayān ca, cVṣ viṣaya : ' abcfhjVṣ
vrātya-, kVṣ rājyā : || bhVṣ Mleccha-śūdr,
kVṣ Mlekṣa-śūdr.

³¹ In glnrBh °tī : cBh Kaute ; dBh Kau-
cīm ; fBh Kāmñcī.

³² In eBh vrātyās te, cf Bh °ca : dBh śūdrās
c-āntyā (one syll. short).

³³ In afṛsBh Mlecchā abr°.

³⁴ So Vā, Bḍ : IVā kalpa.

³⁵ Vṣ similarly—

ete ca tulya-kālāḥ sarve pṛthivyām bhū-
bhṛto bhaviṣyanti* :

where * IVṣ bhokṣyanti.

³⁶ Mlekṣa in cBh.

³⁷ In rBh bhūpateḥ.

³⁸ In dVā a-nṛpā ; bVā hi nṛpāḥ.

³⁹ In fBh nṛpā.

⁴⁰ So Bh ; so jBh, altered from dharmā
nṛpatayaḥ : fBh dharmaparāḥ. Vṣ says—
alpa-prasādā vṛhat-kopāḥ sarva*-kālam
anṛt-ādharma-rucayaḥ :

where * ejVṣ sarve.

GBh xii, 1, 41-43. Of this account the Matsya contains only lines 1, 10; the Brahmanḍa omits ll. 4-6. The Vāyu contains the whole, but fVā omits ll. 4-6; fjkMt omit l. 10; hpMt, kVā have nothing. Vṣ has nothing corresponding to ll. 1-3.

A further description of the evils is given afterwards, see p. 57.

Bhaviṣyantīha¹ Yavanā dharmataḥ kāmato 'rthataḥ
nāiva mūrdh-ābhiṣiktās te² bhaviṣyanti narādhipāḥ
yuga-doṣa-durācārā³ bhaviṣyanti nṛpās tu te
strīnām bala⁴-vadhanāiva haivā cāiva parasparam
bhokṣyanti Kali-śeṣe⁵ tu vasudhām pāṛthivās tathā⁶
udit-ōdita-vamśās⁷ tu⁸ udit-āstamitās⁹ tathā
bhaviṣyantīha¹⁰ paryāye kālena¹¹ pṛthivīkṣitāḥ
vihīnās tu¹² bhaviṣyanti dharmataḥ kāmato 'rthataḥ
tair vimiśrā janapadā¹³ Āryā Mlecchās ca¹⁴ sarvaśaḥ¹⁵
viparyayeṇa vartante¹⁶ kṣayam eṣyanti¹⁷ vai prajāḥ.

¹ In *deh*Vā °ṣyanti ha.

² In *e*Vā tu.

³ In *e*Vā °doṣa durātmāno.

⁴ In *Ca*Vā bala: *e*Vā strī-bāla-go-vadhaṁ kṛtvā, *d*Vā °bāla-bandhanaiś c-āiva. Vṣ similarly—

strī-bāla-go-vadha-kartāraḥ* para-sv-ādāna¹-rucayo² 'lpa-sārāḥ: where **k*Vṣ °bālāmārādha-rucayo; ¹*h*Vṣ °ādātāro, *k*Vṣ parabhyaḍānaka, ²*i*Vṣ para-para-dāma; ³*h*Vṣ 'rucayo. Bh says—

strī-bāla-go-dviḥ-ghnās ca para-dāra-dhan-ādrtaḥ*: where **dh*Bh °āhṛtāḥ, *e*Bh °āvṛtāḥ.

⁵ In *e*Vā bhaviṣyanti Kali-śeṣam.

⁶ In *g*Vā tadā.

⁷ In *e*Vā uditiditi-vamśyās. Vṣ says—udit-āstamita-prāyāḥ sv-alp-āyuso mahēcchā aty-alpa*-dharmās ca¹ bhaviṣyanti: where **ef*Vṣ °ch-āty-alpa, *h*Vṣ °ch-ālpā, *i*Vṣ °chās c-ālpā; ²*j*Vṣ inserts na. Bh says—

udit-āstamita-prāyā alpa-sattv-ālpak-āyusaḥ

a-saṁskṛtāḥ kriyā-hiṁsā rajasā tamas-āvṛtāḥ.

⁸ *Ca*jVā te.

⁹ In *e*Vā uditv-ast°.

¹⁰ In *bdh*Vā °ṣyanti ha.

¹¹ In *f*Vā kālam na.

¹² In *e*Vā vihitās te; *d*Vā vihatās tu.

¹³ In *i*Mt samādānu.

¹⁴ So Mt genly; *bf*Mt, *e*Vā Ārya-M°; *i*Mt varṣā M°; *a*1Mt Mleccha-prāyās ca; *j*Mt ā-Mlecchās c-āiva. Vā genly, *Bd* Mlecch-ācārās ca, *f*Vā °āvārās°, *d*Vā °āvānas° *CVā* Snech° (misprint). Vṣ says—

tais ca vimiśrā* janapadās tac-chilavartino¹ rāj-āśraya-śuśmiṇo Mlecchās c-Āryās* ca viparyayeṇa vartamānāḥ prajāḥ kṣapayisyanti:

where **i*Vṣ vimiśritā; ²*i*Vṣ chil-ānuvart°; ³*k*Vṣ Mlecch-ācāryās, *i*Vṣ °ācārās; *h*Vṣ omits all after Mlecchās. Bh says—

prajāḥ te bhakṣayisyanti Mlecchā rājanya-rūpinaḥ

tan-nāthās te janapadās tac-chil-ācāra-vādināḥ

anyonyato rājabhiś ca kṣayam yasyanti pīditāḥ.

¹⁵ In *a*1bgjkMt sarvataḥ.

¹⁶ In *c*Mt °ta; *gn*Mt, *dg*Vā °taḥ: *e*Vā reads this half line, paryāyai vartamānānām.

¹⁷ So Mt: *g*Mt kṣapayisyanti. Vā, *Bd* nāṣayisyanti.

CHRONOLOGICAL AND ASTRONOMICAL PARTICULARS 57

Chronological and Astronomical Particulars.

Text—AMt 273. 35–52^a; AVā 99, 413–430, Bḍ iii, 74, 225–243.

Corresp. passages—CVṣ iv, 24, 30–42; GBh xii, 2, 24–34.

Concluding passages containing chronological and astronomical particulars about the Kali age are found, more or less full, in all the five Purāṇas. Here the Viṣṇu relinquishes its prose, and both it and the Bhāgavata adhere to an old śloka version (which the Viṣṇu introduces with the phrase *atr-ōcyate*), similar to the version of the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa, but containing some verses not found in those three Purāṇas. Hence it is convenient to divide this subject into three parts.

The first part contains matter which is common to those three Purāṇas, and which the Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata give partially. The passages are these—AMt 273, 35–45^a; AVā 99, 413–423; Bḍ iii, 74, 225–236^a; CVṣ iv, 24, 30–33; GBh xii, 2, 24–28^a. The Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa give the whole, the Matsya all except the first two lines, and the Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata have ll. 1, 2, 4–6, 18–20, 22.

Then those three Purāṇas insert 8 or 9 lines alluding to the evils of the age, which may be omitted, and eVāyu omits most of them. The Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata offer instead other verses giving further particulars, and these constitute the second part, namely—CVṣ iv, 24, 34–39; GBh xii, 2, 28^b–32. The verses in the Bh have been slightly re-arranged to correspond to the Vṣ.

The Purāṇas all unite again in the old śloka version and this forms the third part. The passages are—AMt 273, 49^b–52^a; AVā 99, 428^b–430; Bḍ iii, 74, 241–243; CVṣ iv, 24, 40–42; GBh xii, 2, 33–34. All give the whole, except that the Bhāgavata omits ll. 39, 40; but as there is considerable divergence, the Mt version and that of Vā and Bḍ are printed side by side, and the Vṣ and Bh versions are given in the notes.

As regards MSS eMt omits ll. 21–23; eMt ll. 21–23, 39 (second half)–41 (first half); jMt ll. 15–17, 19; kMt ll. 6–9, 18; lMt ll. 12–15; nMt ll. 13, 14; a²Vā ll. 11–14; eVā l. 16; kVā ll. 1, 2 (first half); mVā ll. 11, 13, 15, and places 12 after 14; hpMt, kVā, and tBh have nothing.

It is no part of the scope of this edition to discuss these chronological and astronomical particulars, beyond what is noticed in the Introdn. § 25, and in the notes to the translation of this passage, *infra*.

Yadā candraś¹ ca sūryaś ca tathā² Tiṣya³. Bṛhaspati
eka-rāśau⁴ sameṣyanti⁵ tadā Kṛta-yugam bhavet⁶

¹ In mVā *vaṁśa vaṁśaś*.

² In jVṣ *yathā*; bVṣ, fBh *yadā*.

³ Śukra in kVṣ.

⁴ Ca²-bfghjVā *rātre*; mVā *rāve*; kVṣ *etair aṁśeṣu*.

⁵ So eVā, Vṣ, Bh; lVṣ *sah-ēṣyanti*. Vā

genly, Bḍ *bhaviṣyanti*; CVā *bhariṣyanti* (misprint).

⁶ So Vā, Bḍ: eVā, Vṣ, arBh *bhaviṣyati tadā (bdefghjVṣ tatah) Kṛtam*; kVṣ gives the line twice and ends first *kṣayam* and then *Kaliḥ*. Bh *tadā bhavati tat Kṛtam*.

58 CHRONOLOGICAL AND ASTRONOMICAL PARTICULARS

eṣa⁷ vaṁśa⁸-kramaḥ kṛtsnaḥ⁹ kīrtito yo¹⁰ yathā-kramam¹¹
 atītā vartamānās ca tathāivānāgatās¹² ca ye¹³
 Mahāpadm¹⁴-ābhiṣekāt tu¹⁵ | yāvat Parikṣito¹⁶ janma
 yāvaj janma¹⁷ Parikṣitaḥ | yāvan Nand-ābhiṣecanam⁵
 evaṁ¹⁸ varṣa¹⁹-sahasraṁ tu jñeyam²⁰ pañcāśad-uttaram²¹
 Pulomās tu²² tathā-Āndhrās tu²³ | pramāṇam vai tathā vaktum²⁴
 Mahāpadm-āntare²⁵ punaḥ²⁶ | Mahāpadm-āntaram²⁷ ca yat²⁸
 antaram tac²⁹ chatāny³⁰ aṣṭau ṣaṭ-trimśat³¹ tu³² samās tathā³³
 tāvat³⁴ kāl-āntaram bhāvyam³⁵ Andhr-ānt-ādyāḥ prakīrtitāḥ³⁶

⁷ So Vā, Bd, *beden*Mt. *ACfgjklmMt evam*.

⁸ In *eVā eva*.

⁹ So Mt, *bdehVā*. Vā genly *kṛtsnaḥ*; *eMt kṛtaḥ praśnaḥ*, *eMt kṣataḥ*.

¹⁰ So Mt genly; *cenMt 'yam*: *eVā vā*. Vā, Bd *vo*.

¹¹ Mt *mayā kramāt*.

¹² So *CfgjMt*, Vā, Bd, Vṣ. Mt genly reads the whole line in the nomin. sing., and *bMt* the first half in locat. sing. Bh says—

ye 'tītā vartamānā ye bhaviṣyanti ca pāṭhivāḥ:

but *deBh ye bhaviṣyanti pāṭhivāḥ* for the second half.

¹³ In *fgMt tu ye*. After this line Vṣ inserts this line—

ete vaṁśeṣu bhūpālāḥ kathitā muni-sattamā.

Bh inserts this line—

te ta uddeśataḥ proktā vaṁśīyāḥ *Soma-Sūryayoh:

where **fBh vaṁśayoh*, *adrsBh vaṁśa-jāḥ*.

¹⁴ This line is in Mt, Vā, Bd. So Mt. Bd *Mahānand-*, Vā *Mahādev-*, which both no doubt = *Mahāpadm-*; see l. 7.

¹⁵ Bd *°sek-āntam*.

¹⁶ This line is in Vṣ, Bh. So Vṣ. Bh *ārābhya bhavato* equivalently.

¹⁷ So Mt. Vā, Bd *janma yāvat*.

¹⁸ So Mt, *eVā*: *lmMt ekaṁ*; *kVṣ ete*: others *etad*.

¹⁹ In *celnMt eva*; *bMt eka*.

²⁰ Bh *śatam*; *jBh satam*.

²¹ So Mt genly, Vā, Bd: *cejMt °sat-ōttaram*, *bMt °sato trayam*: *lmMt*, *blVṣ pañca-sat-ōttaram*. But *eVā*, Vṣ, Bh *pañcāśad-ōttaram*.

²² This line is in Mt. So *fjmMt*; *bcenMt °te*; *gMt Pulobhās tu*; *eVā* also *Pulomā ca*. *ACdklMt Paulomās tu*. The correct reading

would seem to be *Pulomāt tu*, referring to the last Andhra king.

²³ So *ACdklMt*; *bMt °Āndhrās tu*; *fgMt tato 'ndhrās tu*; *jMt tathā-Āndhrās tu*; *nMt tathā c=Āndhra*; *cMt tathārv=Āndhrā*; *eMt tathārvākaḥ*. The correct reading seems to be *tathā-Āndhrāt tu*.

²⁴ This line is in Vā, Bd. So *a¹a²a³dfghlVā*, Bd; *mVā °vaktu*; 3 MSS of *CVā °vaktam* (= Pkt *vuttam*!); *a²jVā*, 3 MSS of *CVā °c-ōktam*: *eVā* (see note²²) *tato vaktum*; *bVā yathā vaktur*. *Vuttam* is most prob. the original Pkt word, and all these are attempts to Sanskritize it without infringing sandhi.

²⁵ In *bMt -ōttare*.

²⁶ In *jMt puraḥ*.

²⁷ So Vā. Bd *-ōttaram*.

²⁸ In *eVā yataḥ*.

²⁹ So Vā. Bd *°ca*. Mt genly *anantaram*; *jMt antare ṣaṭ*. This half line in *lMt* is *nā[nā]ntaram pakṣatāny aṣṭau*; in *bMt tanaṁtastastanāmatyau*.

³⁰ In *eMt śatā*.

³¹ So also *nMt ṣaḍimśat* (= *ṣaṭ-trimśat*); *dMt ṣastr°*: *bMt*, *a³bVā ṣaḍ-vimśac*, *dVā ṣaḍ-v°*; *hVā ṣatrimśac* or *ṣaḍr°*.

³² So Mt. Vā, Bd *ca*.

³³ So Mt. Vā, Bd *smṛtāḥ*.

³⁴ So Mt. Vā, Bd *etat*.

³⁵ So Mt, *efmVā*, Bd; *cMt bhāvya*. Vā genly *bhāvya*.

³⁶ So *a²-fghmVā*, Bd; *bdVā c=Ān°*. *Ca¹jVā Andhr-āntā ye* (l omits *ye*) *pra°*; *eVā sandhān bhāvyaḥ pra°*. Mt genly *Andhr-āntād ā-Parikṣitaḥ*; *fgMt Andhr°*, *cenMt kṣatr°*: *bMt tsaṁbhṛtrādāyarakṣināt*, *jMt athādya dipitūs tataḥ*. Mt reading is corrupt, because from *Parikṣit* to the end of the Andhras comprises the two periods in

CHRONOLOGICAL AND ASTRONOMICAL PARTICULARS 59

Bhaviṣye³⁷ te prasaṅkhyātāḥ³⁸ purāṇa-jnāiḥ śrutarsibhiḥ³⁹ 10
 saptarṣayas tadā⁴⁰ prāṁśu⁴¹
 pradīpten-āgninā⁴² samāḥ⁴⁴
 sapta⁴⁷-vīmśati-bhāvyaṇām⁴⁸
 Andhrāṇ-ānte⁵¹ 'nvagāt⁵² punaḥ⁵³
 saptarṣayas tu vartante⁵⁷
 yatra⁶⁰ nakṣatra-maṇḍale

saptarṣayas tadā prāhuḥ⁴²

Pratipe rājñi⁴⁵ vai śatam⁴⁶

sapta-vīmśaiḥ śatair⁴⁹ bhāvya⁵⁰

Andhrāṇ-ānte⁵⁴ 'nvayāḥ⁵⁵ punaḥ⁵⁶

sapta-vīmśati⁵⁸-paryante⁵⁹

kṛtsne nakṣatra-maṇḍale

ll. 5-8. The reckoning is from the end of the Andhras onwards into the future.

³⁷ So Mt: cMt °syai; lMt omits. Vā, Bd bhaviṣyais; bVā na divyais.

³⁸ So Mt genly: cēlMt °samākhyaṭāḥ; jMt, eVā tat prasaṅkhyātām. Ca'a'a'jVā, Bd tatra saṅkhyātāḥ; a'Vā °khyātām; bdfghlmVā °khyānām: bMt naṣṭa-saṅkhyā-nāḥ.

³⁹ In lMt [śu]śrū[śa]tārsibhiḥ; bMt surarṣibhiḥ; jMt maharṣibhiḥ: ceMt purāṇe śruti-sarpibhiḥ.

⁴⁰ In bdefgjnmMt tathā.

⁴¹ This line is in Mt. So ACdkmMt: eMt pāṁśru (or yā); cMt pāśu; nMt prāyuh or prāpuḥ; bMt āyuh; fgMt te syuh; jMt vācyāḥ. These readings and Vā, Bd readings appear to be crp. It seems necessary to the sense of this whole passage that some lunar constellation should be meant here, and the true reading may perhaps be Puṣye. Puṣya as the constellation in Pratipa's time might tally with Maghā in Parikṣit's time (see ll. 22, 24) about a century and a half later; see JRAS, 1910, p. 28.

⁴² So Vā; gVā prāhu. Bd prāptāḥ: eVā [ca] tathākhyaṣ ca.

⁴³ So Mt genly: dMt pradīpen°; kMt pratāpten°; jMt pradīptā c-āgni vai. Mt appears to be crp.

⁴⁴ So ACImMt: cdefgknMt samam; bMt samam; jMt sāse.

⁴⁵ So Vā genly; hVā °rojñi; eVā °rājā: dVā Pratīpaṁ rājñi, altered to Pratīpa-rājñi. Bd pitrye Pārīkṣite (omitting vai).

⁴⁶ In fjVā vīmśatam; eVā saṁsthite. All the readings of this line in Mt, Vā, and Bd are no doubt attempts to Sanskritize an old Prakrit śloka, which was obscure. Perhaps the true reading should be, having regard to the forms of letters in the old scripts—

saptarṣayas tadā Puṣye Pratīpe rājñi vai samam:

cf. samam in l. 19; or śatam, see l. 22.

⁴⁷ This line is in Mt: cMt saptā; bnMt aṣṭā.

⁴⁸ So ACkMt: cdefgjnmMt bhāvryena; bMt bhāvryena.

⁴⁹ So Vā genly, Bd: dVā °vīmśati tair; bhVā °vīmśatair (short): eVā saptā-vīmśe śate, prob. the true reading.

⁵⁰ In eVā bhāvrye.

⁵¹ So ACmMt for first 3 syll.: dMt Andh° fgMt Adh°: bcenMt astrāṇām; jkMt astre-ṇām. For last syll. cefgjknMt te; ACbmMt tu; dMt tvam. The whole is clearly Andhrāṇ-ānte, see note ⁵⁴.

⁵² In kMt 'nvagā, ceMt °gāt, nMt °gat: fMt 'ndhakāt; gMt dhakāt; jMt 'ṣṭakā; ACMt yadā; bdmMt tataḥ. The correct word seems to be 'nvagāt (aorist of anugā) or 'nugāḥ, the former meaning '(the cycle) followed on again', and the latter '(the Seven Rsis were) following on again'. The readings are thus equivalent, but the former seems preferable, because the v appears to be original, and was easily misread as dh in the Gupta script, while yadā and tataḥ are obvious emendations.

⁵³ In jMt sudhāḥ.

⁵⁴ For first 3 syll. Vā, Bd Andhrāṇām, hVā °nā; eVā mantrāṇām. For fourth syll. Vā, Bd te. The whole is clearly Andhrāṇāmte, which means Andhrāṇ-ānte, Pkt for Andhrāṇām ante, as the sense shows. But mVā reads this half line Adhā saṅkhyayā smṛtam, which belongs partly to l. 15.

⁵⁵ So a'hVā, Bd; and dVā (altered from tvayāḥ); gVā 'nvayā; eVā 'nvayāḥ. Vā genly tvayā.

⁵⁶ In bVā punat; gVā yutāḥ; a'Vā subhāḥ.

⁵⁷ This line is in Mt. So CGVa'a'mMt; dMt °pravartante: jMt saptarṣay-ēti paryante: a'a'bMt sapta-vīmśati-paryante, ceMt °paryanta-h, kMt °paryataḥ, fgMt °parjanya.

⁵⁸ This line is in Vā, Bd: eVā °vīmś-ēti or vīmśe 't:

60 CHRONOLOGICAL AND ASTRONOMICAL PARTICULARS

saptarṣayas tu tiṣṭhanti ⁶¹ paryāyena ⁶² śataṁ śatam ⁶³
 saptarṣiṇām yugam hy etad ⁶⁴ divyayā saṅkhyayā smṛtam ⁶⁵ 15
 māsā ⁶⁶ divyāḥ ⁶⁷ smṛtāḥ ⁶⁸ ṣaṭ ca ⁶⁹ divy-ābdāni tu ⁷⁰ sapta hi ⁷¹
 tebhyāḥ ⁷² pravartate kālo ⁷³ divyāḥ saptarṣibhis ⁷⁴ tu vai ⁷⁵
 saptarṣiṇām ⁷⁶ tu ⁷⁷ yau pūrvau ⁷⁸ dr̥śyete ⁷⁹ uditau niśi ⁸⁰
 tayor madhye tu nakṣatraṁ ⁸¹ dr̥śyate yat ⁸² samam divi ⁸³
 tena saptarṣayo ⁸⁴ yuktā jñeyā ⁸⁵ vyomni śataṁ samāḥ ⁸⁶ 20
 nakṣatrāṇām ṛṣiṇām ca ⁸⁷ yogasyaitan ⁸⁸ nidarśanam

⁶⁰ In dVā paryate; bVā payate.

⁶¹ In bcefgjMt kṛtsne.

⁶² In bMt bhidyanti.

⁶³ In fMt paryāye sā.

⁶⁴ In fMt śataṁ satam; dMt śataḥ śatam; a¹a²d³fgVā śatāc chatam; b¹Vā śatān śatam; mVā śatā śatam: a¹bMt śataṁ samāḥ.

⁶⁵ So Vā; eVā hy etc; Bd tv etad; fgMt yuge hy etad, kMt °ete: bhVā sugam hy etad. But bMt tu paryanta, cenMt °paryāye. Mt genly upary etat.

⁶⁶ So Vā, Bd: cenMt tat smṛtaṁ divya-saṅkhyayā: kMt smṛtaṁ vai divya-saṅkhyayā, ACMt °sañjñayā: fgMt smṛtaṁ divyaṁ tu saṅkhyayā; bmMt °sañjñayā, and dMt crp.

⁶⁷ So Bd. Vā genly sā sū; jVā sāsā; mVā sāpa; hVā saṣā; fVā sās[sā]ya. Mt samā; nMt samo; eMt kṣado; cMt tado. Instead of this line eVā has two other lines—

ṣaṣtir daivata-yugānām c-aika saptabhir
 epi ca
 trimśac c-ānyāni varṣāni smṛtaḥ saptarṣi-
 vatsaraḥ.

⁶⁸ So Mt, Bd. Vā divyā: nMt dītās; ceMt dītvāt.

⁶⁹ Vā smṛtā; bcefglnMt tathā.

⁷⁰ So Bd. Mt, Vā ṣaṣtir erroneously.

⁷¹ So ACjklMt; cnMt °ca; eMt divy-āṣṭāni ca. Bd divy-ābdās c-aiva. Vā divy-āhnās c-aiva: bdmMt °āhāni tu (b, ca), fgMt °āhāniś ca.

⁷² So Bd: cdegnMt, gVā saptati-ḥ; other Mt, Vā genly saptabhiḥ; jVā saptāmiḥ: bhVā saptarṣanabhiḥ, where in bVā nabhiḥ represents tebhyāḥ in next line.

⁷³ So Vā, Bd, bceklMt: eVā ebhyaḥ; other Mt ebhiḥ: dVā reads this half line pravartate mahān kālo.

⁷⁴ In kMt pravartitaḥ, dMt pravartane; bMt °ite kōle.

⁷⁴ In cenMt saptarṣitas.

⁷⁵ So Mt, eVā. Vā, Bd taiḥ.

⁷⁶ In fgMt sapta-ṣiṣaṁ.

⁷⁷ In ACdkmMt, Vṣ genly, aBh ca.

⁷⁸ So CGVa^mMt, Bd, Vṣ, Bh; arBh pūrvau yau. Vā ye pūrvā (altered in dVā to yau pūrvau), akVṣ °pūrve: a¹⁻³bcefglnMt, eVā yaḥ pūrvam, kMt °pūrva, jMt °pūrve. The dual is right as there are two stars, and see next line.

⁷⁹ So CGVa^mMt, Bd, Vṣ, Bh, dVā. Vā genly dr̥śyante; ehVā, aVṣ dr̥śyate. For this half line a¹⁻³bcefglnMt read udyan (l, udyat; j, mudyan; k, sudhan) vai dr̥śyate niśi (j, divi; k omits): fgMt udyāte dr̥śyate niśi.

⁸⁰ CGVa^mMt hy uditau niśi; eVā hy uditō. Vṣ, Bh uditau divi; aVṣ °bhyuditaū; jkVṣ, jBh uditō; gBh uditē. Vā, Bd ullarā-diśi.

⁸¹ So Mt genly, Bd; fgMt °madhye 'ti; eVā °madhye ca [tam]; bMt °mādye tu rajatam. Bh, blVṣ tayos tu madhye nakṣatraṁ; Vṣ °madhya-nak; kVṣ °madhyamam kṣatraṁ. In a³Vā tato madhye ca nakṣatraṁ; Vā genly °madhyena ca kṣetraṁ; bdhVā °cākṣetraṁ (altered in d to ca nakṣatraṁ); mVā crp.

⁸² In nMt yaḥ; eVā, bVṣ, dfkqBh tat; ceMt sa; bMt ca.

⁸³ Vṣ, Bh niśi.

⁸⁴ Bh ten-aita ṛṣayo; aberBh ten-aiva; fBh tena vai.

⁸⁵ So Vā, Bd; lVā °yayā. Mt genly jñeyā yuktā, jMt °muktā, bdmMt °bhuktā; lMt devā yuktā. Vṣ, Bh yuktās tiṣṭhanty, aVṣ muktās; kVṣ muktāsthityanty; fBh yuktā bhavānti.

⁸⁶ In bVā śate. Vṣ, Bh abda-śataṁ nr̥ṇām; hVṣ, gBh aṣṭa-s; kVṣ aka-s.

⁸⁷ In eVā ca sarveṣāḥ.

⁸⁸ So Mt, Vā genly: bdgVā yogasya. Bd

CHRONOLOGICAL AND ASTRONOMICAL PARTICULARS 61

saptarṣayo Maghā-yuktāḥ ⁸⁹ kāle Pārikṣite ⁹⁰ śatam ⁹¹
Andhr-āṇṭe ⁹² tu ⁹³ catur-vimśe ⁹⁴ bhaviṣyanti ⁹⁵ śatam samāḥ ⁹⁶.

Viṣṇu.

te tu Pārikṣite kāle
Maghāsv āsan ⁹⁷ dvijottama

tadā pravṛttaś ca ⁹⁹ Kalir dvādaś-ābda¹-śat-ātmakah
yad-aiiva bhagavad-Viṣṇor
amśo yāto ³ divam dvija ⁴
Vasudeva-kul-ōdbhūtas
tad-aiiva Kalir āgataḥ ⁶

yāvat sa pāda-padmābhyām
pasparś-ēmān vasundharām
tāvat prthivī-pariṣvaṅge
samartho n-ābhavat Kalih
gate sanātanasya-āmśe ¹⁰
Viṣṇos tatra bhuvo ¹¹ divam ¹²
tatyāja s-ānujo rājyaṁ
Dharma-putro Yudhiṣṭhirah

Bhāgavata.

te tvadiye dvijāḥ kāle
adhunā c-āśritā ⁹⁸ Maghāḥ
yadā devarṣayaḥ sapta
Maghāsu vicaranti hi 25

Viṣṇor bhagavato ² bhānuḥ
Kṛṣṇ-ākhyo 'sau ⁵ divam gataḥ

tad-āviśat Kalir lokam
pāpe yad ramate janāḥ ⁷
yāvat sa pāda-padmābhyām
sprśann āste ⁸ Ramā-patih
tāvat Kalir vai prthivīm
parākrāntum na c-āśakat ⁹ 30

*bhogasy*⁹⁰: *hVā yogyasya tan*; *bMt tu yogasy-*
ēti; *nMt* reads this half line *yāgasy-ēti*
darśayan.

⁸⁹ *Bd hy ath-āyuktāḥ*; *fgMt mayā hy*
uktāḥ, *dMt may-āpy*⁹⁰; *eVā mayā proktāḥ*.

⁹⁰ In *jMt* this half line is *kālena paritoṣitāḥ*,
*kMt*⁹¹ *otam*.

⁹¹ In *nMt* *śrutam*; *bMt* *kṣutan*; *fgMt*
same; *mMt* *divi*.

⁹² So *a'ā'ā'ghVā*; *IVā Andh-°*, *bVā Adhm-°*,
dVā Adhry-°; *eVā Andhān-ānte* (omitting
tu) in *Pkt* form, see note ⁹⁴. *Ca'jmVā*, *Bd*
Andhr-āmśe, *fVā Adhr°*. *Mt* genly *brāh-*
maṇās (= *saptarṣayaḥ* ?); *CMt* *°nas*; *fgMt*
°nam.

⁹³ So *Mt* genly; *jMt* *ca*. *Vā* genly, *Bd* *sa-*
⁹⁴ *ChfgMt* *°sa*; *jMt*, *dVā* *°so*; *nMt* *°śad*.

⁹⁵ In *fMt*, *dVā* *°syati*.

⁹⁶ So *Mt*, *Bd*; *fMt* *satam°*; *dVā* *sate°*
(altered to *gate°*): *jmMt*, *fVā* *sate mama*.

bhMt *°manā*, *gMt* *°matā*: *eVā śatan tadā*;
IVā same matā. *AVā mātē mama*.

⁹⁷ In *bVś* *Maghās c-āsan*; *kVś* *†Maghā-*
dyāsan; *ajVś* *erp*.

⁹⁸ In *gBh* *hy āśritā*

⁹⁹ So *Vś*. *Bh tu*.

¹ In *hVś*, *gBh* *āṣṭa*; *IVś* *ātma*.

² In *dBh* *Viṣṇus tu bhagavān*.

³ In *abVś* *jāto*; *kVs* *amśa-jāto*.

⁴ In *kVś* *dvijottama*.

⁵ In *sBh* *sa*: *dBh* *Kṛṣṇo 'sau*; *eBh*
†Kṛṣṇasyotsau *apptly*.

⁶ In *blVś* *°aiv-ātr-āgataḥ Kalih*.

⁷ In *dBh* *manah*.

⁸ In *fBh* *āsīd*.

⁹ In *fBh* *v-ās°*; *kqrBh* *c-āśakṛt*.

¹⁰ In *deVś* *-āntē*.

¹¹ In *kVś* *trayo*; *aVś* *divo*.

¹² In *ahVś* *divi*.

62 CHRONOLOGICAL AND ASTRONOMICAL PARTICULARS

Viṣṇu.

viparītāni dṛṣṭvā ca
nimittāni sa Pāṇḍavaḥ
yāte Kṛṣṇe cakārātha
so 'bhiṣekam Parikṣitaḥ¹³
prayāsyanti yadā cāite
Pūrv-Āśādhām maharṣayaḥ
tadā Nandāt¹⁵ prabhṛty¹⁶ eṣa¹⁷

Bhāgavata.

yadā Maghābhyo¹⁴ yāsyanti
Pūrv-Āśādhām maharṣayaḥ 35
Kalir vṛddhiṁ gamiṣyati¹⁸.

yasmin Kṛṣṇo divaṁ yātas¹⁹ tasminn eva tad-āhani²⁰
pratipannam Kali-yugaṁ²¹ tasya saṅkhyāṁ nibodhata²²
catuḥ-śata²³-sahasraṁ tu
varṣāṇām²⁴ vai²⁵ smṛtam budhaiḥ²⁶
ṣaṣṭi-varṣa²⁸-sahasrāṇi
saṅkhyātam²⁹ mānuṣeṇa tu³⁰

sahasrāṇām śatān-āha
trīṇi mānuṣa-saṅkhyayā²⁷
ṣaṣṭim cāiva sahasrāṇi
varṣāṇām tucyate³¹ Kalih³² 40

¹³ So all Vṣ, but CVṣ °kṣite.¹⁴ In bBh °bhyām; dBh Maghāto.¹⁵ In jVṣ °Nanda, eBh °Nandāt; dBh tadā tadā: rBh tato Nandāt.¹⁶ In deVṣ prabhūm.¹⁷ In bjkVṣ, eBh eva.¹⁸ In eBh kariṣyati.¹⁹ In eVā divā jāta: jMt reads—

yadā Kṛṣṇaś chavi yātaḥ śuklo Nārāyaṇas tathā.

²⁰ So Mt, eVā, Vṣ, Bh. Vā, Bd tadā dine, altered in dVā to tad-āditaḥ.²¹ So Mt, eVā, Vṣ, Bh. Vā, Bd °pannaḥ °yugaḥ.²² So Vā, Bd. Vṣ °nibodha me. Mt pramāṇam tasya me śṛṇu; lMt prapannaṁ°. Bh iti prākuḥ purā-vidah; dBh iti-r-ākuḥ°, see Appendix I, § ii.²³ So Mt; jMt śatā; eMt śatī: aMt ṣaṣṭi; dmMt ṣaṭ (one syll. short).²⁴ In bMt varṇāni: eMt reads this half line tadā sandhyā pravartate.²⁵ In cMt yat; fgjkmMt tat; dMt tu; bMt na (for nu?).²⁶ In jMt tathā.²⁷ So Vā, Bd.²⁸ So bjklnMt; a¹⁻³dmMt ṣaṣṭir°; cfgMt ṣaṣṭim. AOMt catvāry aṣṭa-.²⁹ In bfgnMt °khyāta; dMt °khyāte.³⁰ In jMt tat.³¹ So Bd, fVā; gVā tyūso; bVā tuc°; dVā tucyāta, altered to tu smṛtaḥ; mVā rūvyate (for r-ucyate?), see Appendix I, § ii. Vā genly ucyate.³² Instead of this and the preceding line Vṣ has these lines—trīṇi lakṣāṇi varṣāṇām* dvija mānuṣa'-saṅkhyayā
ṣaṣṭim cāiva sahasrāṇi bhaviṣyaty eṣa vai Kalih:

where *hVṣ varṣāṇi; †lVṣ varṣāṇān dvija. Bh omits this statement.

³³ In gMt divya-. CVā divye.³⁴ So a³a¹cfjklmnMt: CGVa¹a²bdMt °saṅkhyā°; jMt tathā sandhy-āpav°, unless it = °sandhyā prav°.³⁵ So Vā genly: fmVā °āmsam hi kīrtite, Bd °āmsē°; jVā °sandhyā sihā kīrtite. But glVā °sandhy-āmsa hi kīrtiyate, a¹a³Vā °sandhyā sā hi°, bhVā °sandhyā sā hi [tā]°: dVā for this half line (with clerical errors uncanceled) saṁdvedhiś ca iti tathā saṁdhyā saṁdhy-āmsa sahita kīrtiyate: eVā sa-sandhy-āmsam udāhṛtam. For this line Vṣ reads—
śatāni tāni divyāni sapta pañca ca saṅkhyayā*:

where *hVṣ divyayā; but sandhyayā appears to be the correct word since 1200

CHRONOLOGICAL AND ASTRONOMICAL PARTICULARS 63

divyam varṣa-sahasram tu		divyam ³³ varṣa-sahasram tu .
tadā sandhyā pravartate ³⁴		tat-sandhy-āmsam prakīrtitam ³⁵
niḥśeṣe tu ³⁶ tadā ³⁷ tasmin ³⁸ Kṛtam vai pratipatsyate ³⁹		

divine years include the two sandhyās. Bh
says—

divy-ābdānām * sahasr-ānte caturthe tu¹
punaḥ Kṛtam :

where * *gkp*Bh *āṣṭānām* ; ¹ *c*Bh *caturthena*.

³⁶ This line is in Mt, Vā, Bd, Vṣ. So Mt,
*e*Vā. Vā, Bd °*ca* ; *d*Vā *niḥśeṣe* *ca*. Vṣ
niḥśeṣena, *j*Vṣ °*śeṣanam*.

³⁷ Vṣ *tatas*.

³⁸ In *j*Mt *tasya*.

³⁹ So Mt, Vā, Bd. Vṣ *bhaviṣyati punaḥ*
(*a*Vṣ *tadā*) *Kṛtam*. Bh adds—

bhaviṣyati yadā * *nṛṇām mana ātma-*
prakāśakam :

where * *adqr*Bh and v. r. in *GBh tadā* ; ¹ *c*Bh
ātm-āp°.



TRANSLATION

This translation is close to the original though not absolutely literal, and generally combines the various versions where they supplement one another. Words in italics are not expressed in the original but are supplied to complete the meaning. The notes deal only with the salient points, and for the rest reference must be made to the notes to the original text.

Preface.

Listen as I narrate all future *events*, as Vyāsa, unwearied in work, proclaimed to me formerly, both the future Kali age and the manvantaras also. Thus I will first declare now the kings who are to be, both those descended from Aila¹ and the Ikṣvākus and also the kings descended from Sudyumna², among whom the splendid kṣatriya stock of the families of Aila and Ikṣvāku is brought to an end. I will proclaim all those kings as mentioned in the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa. Moreover *there will be* other kings besides them, who shall arise, kṣatriyas, pāraśavas³, śūdras, and others who will be foreigners; Andhras, Śakas and Pulindas, Cūlikas and Yavanas, Kai-vartas, Abhīras and Savaras, and others who will be of Mleccha origin; Pauravas, Vītihoṭras, Vaidīśas, five⁴ Kosalas, Mekalas, Kośulas⁵, Paundras, Gaunardas, and Svāspṛakas, Sunidharmas, Śakas, Nīpas and others who will be of Mleccha race. I will declare those kings according to the total of their years⁶ and by name.

Mleccha

Pauravas.

Abhimanyu's son by Virāṭa's daughter Uttarā was Parīkṣit. Parīkṣit's son was king Janamejaya who was very righteous. From Janamejaya was born valiant Śatānīka. Śatānīka's son was valiant Aśvamedhadatta.

From Aśvamedhadatta was born a victorious son, righteous Adhisīmākṛṣṇa⁷, who now reigns great in fame.

Adhisīmākṛṣṇa's son will be king Nicakṣu⁸. When the city Hastināpura is carried away by the Ganges, Nicakṣu will abandon it and will dwell in Kauśāmbī.

Abhimanyu

Parīkṣit

Janamejaya

Śatānīka

Aśvamedhadatta

Adhisīmākṛṣṇa

Nicakṣu

¹ That is the Pauravas.

² See p. 2, note ¹⁵.

³ A mixed caste said to be descended from a brahman father and śūdra mother.

⁴ This would seem to be meant for Pañcālas.

⁵ The people of Mahākosala aptly.

⁶ Or Mt, 'according to their succession'.

⁷ Or Aśīmākṛṣṇa.

⁸ Or Virakṣu. Vā Nirvaktra. Bh Nemi-cakra.

He will have eight sons of great might and valour. His eldest son *will be* Uṣṇa¹; after Uṣṇa Citraratha is remembered; after Citraratha Śucidratha²; and after Śucidratha Vṛṣṇimat³; and after Vṛṣṇimat Suṣeṇa will be a pure king. After Suṣeṇa Sunītha⁴ will be king; after Sunītha will be Ruca⁵; after him will be Nṛcakṣus⁶. Nṛcakṣus' heir will be Sukhībala⁷; and Sukhībala's son will be king Pariplava⁸; and Pariplava's son will be king Sunaya⁹. His heir Medhāvin will be king; and Medhāvin's son will be Nṛpañjaya. Durva¹⁰ will be his son; and Tigmātman his son. After Tigma will be Bhadratha; after Bhadratha Vasudāna¹¹; after Vasudāna Satānika; after him will be Udayana¹²; and after Udayana will be the warrior king Vahīnara¹³; and Vahīnara's son will be Daṇḍapāṇi¹⁴. After Daṇḍapāṇi Nirāmitra¹⁵; and after Nirāmitra Kṣemaka.

These 25 kings will exist born of Pūrṇi's race. In this connexion this genealogical verse was sung by ancient brahmins—'The race honoured by gods and rishis, from which sprang brahmins and kṣatriyas, will verily on reaching Kṣemaka reach its end in the Kali age.' Thus has been correctly proclaimed this Paurava race, the offspring of Pāṇḍu's wise son, high-souled Arjuna.

Aikṣvākus.

Next I will declare the race of the high-souled Ikṣvākus. Bhadbala's heir was the warrior king Bṛhatkṣaya¹⁶. His son was Urukṣaya¹⁶; after Urukṣaya was Vatsavyūha¹⁷; after Vatsavyūha Prativyoma¹⁸.

His son is Divākara¹⁹ who now rules the city Ayodhyā in Madhyadeśa.

Divākara's successor will be famous Sahadeva. Sahadeva's heir will be high-minded Bṛhadeśva²⁰; his successor will be Bhānuratha²¹; and his son will be Pratitāśva²²; and Pratitāśva's son will be Supratika²³. His son will be Marudeva²⁴, and his son Sunakṣatra. After Sunakṣatra will be victorious Kinnarāśva²⁵; and Antarikṣa will be Kinnarāśva's great son. After Antarikṣa will be Suparṇa²⁶; and

¹ Mt Bhūri.

² Bh Kaviratha and Kuv°.

³ Or Vṛṣṭimat. Vā Dhṛtimat.

⁴ Vā Sūtīrtha.

⁵ Vṣ Rca.

⁶ Vā Tricakṣa.

⁷ Vṣ Sukhābala. Bh Sukhīnala.

⁸ Or Paripluta or Pariṣṇava.

⁹ Mt Sutapas.

¹⁰ Mt Urva. Vṣ Mṛdu. Gr Hari.

¹¹ Mt Vasudāman. Gr Sudānaka. Bh Sudāsa.

¹² Gr Udāna. Bh Durdamana.

¹³ Or Mahīnara. Vṣ Ahīnara.

¹⁴ Vṣ Khandapāṇi.

¹⁵ Vṣ Naramitra. Bh Nimi.

¹⁶ For the variations in these names see p. 9.

¹⁷ Mt Vatsadroha. Bh Vatsavṛddha. Vṣ inserts a king Vatsa before him.

¹⁸ Vā Prativyūha.

¹⁹ Bh Bhānu Divārka.

²⁰ Mt Dhruvāśva.

²¹ Bh Bhānumat. Mt crp.

²² Mt Pratipāśva. Bh Pratikāśva. Gr Pratīvya.

²³ Mt Supratipa. Vā Supratita. Gr Pratitaka.

²⁴ Vā Sahadeva.

²⁵ Or Kinnara. Bh Puṣkara.

²⁶ Mt Suṣeṇa. Vṣ Suvarṇa. Bh Sutapas.

AIKSVĀKUS AND BĀRHADRATHAS

67

after Suparṇa Amitrajit¹. His son *will be* Bṛhadbhrāja². Dharmin³ is remembered as his son. Dharmin's son will be Kṛtañjaya. Kṛtañjaya's son will be wise Raṇañjaya⁴; and after Raṇañjaya will be Sañjaya, a warrior king. Sañjaya's son *will be* Śākya. After Śākya *will be* king Śuddhodana⁵. Śuddhodana's son will be Siddhārtha; Rāhula⁶ *will be* his son. After him will be Prasenajit⁷. After him will be Kṣudraka. After Kṣudraka will be Kulaka⁸. After Kulaka Suratha is remembered; and Suratha's son Sumitra will be the last king.

These Aikṣvākus have been declared, who will exist in the Kali age; born in Bṛhadbala's lineage they will enhance their family, being warriors and learned, true to their word, self-restrained. *These* kings who were ancient have been all declared. In this connexion this genealogical verse was sung by ancient brahmins—'This race of the Ikṣvākus will terminate with Sumitra; on reaching king Sumitra it will indeed reach its end in the Kali age.' Thus has been declared the kṣatriya stock descended from Manu, and that descended from Aila.

Bārhadhrathas.

Next I will declare the Bārhadhrathas of Magadha, who are kings in Sahadeva's lineage in Jarāsandha's race, those past, those existing and also those who will exist. I will declare them according to their prominence: listen as I speak.

When the Bhārata battle took place and Sahadeva was slain, his heir Somādhi⁹ became king in Girivraja; he reigned 58 years. In his lineage Śrutaśravas was 64 years¹⁰. Ayutāyus reigned 26 years¹¹. His *successor* Niramitra enjoyed the earth 40 years¹² and went to heaven. Sukṣatra¹³ obtained the earth 56 years. Bṛhaṭkarmān¹⁴ reigned 23 years.

Senājit¹⁵ is now enjoying the earth the same number of years¹⁶.

Śrutañjaya will be for 40 years, great in strength, large of arm, great in mind and prowess. Vibhu will obtain the earth 28 years¹⁷; and Śuci will stand in the kingdom 58 years. King Kṣema will enjoy the earth 28 years. Valiant Suvrata¹⁸ will obtain the kingdom 64 years. Sunetra will enjoy the earth 35 years¹⁹ (or

¹ Mt calls him *Sumitra* also.

² Mt, Vṣ, Bh *Bṛhadrāja*. Vā *Bharadvāja*.

³ Mt *crp*.

⁴ Gr *Dhanastraya*. Vā *apptly* inserts a king *Vrāta* before him.

⁵ Vṣ *Kṛuddhodana*.

⁶ Vṣ *Rāhula*. Gr *Bāhula*. Bh *Lāṅgala*. Mt *Puskala*.

⁷ Gr *Senajit*.

⁸ Vā *Kṣulika*. Vṣ *Kuṇḍaka*. Gr *Kuḍava*. Bh *Ranaka*.

⁹ Bḍ, some Vṣ, Gr *Somāpi*. Vṣ *genly* *Somāmi*. Bh *Mārjāri*

¹⁰ Vṣ *Śrutavat*. Bḍ, many Vā, 67 years.

¹¹ Mt *Apratipin*. Mt, some Vā, 36 years.

¹² Vā, Bḍ, 100 years.

¹³ Vā *Sukṛtta*. Mt *Surakṣa*. Bh *Suna-kṣatra*.

¹⁴ Bh *Bṛhatsena*. Gr *Bahukarmaka*.

¹⁵ Bh *Karmajit*.

¹⁶ That is, 23 years. Mt, 50.

¹⁷ Vṣ, Bh *Vipra*. Vā, Bḍ *merely nṛpa*, and say 35 years.

¹⁸ Vā *genly Bhuvata*. Mt *Anuvrata*.

¹⁹ Some Mt, 25 years.

Dharmanetra¹ will be 5 full years). And Nirvṛti² will enjoy this earth 58 years. Trinetra will next enjoy the kingdom 28 years (or Suśrama's³ sovereignty will last 38 years). Dṛdhasena will be 48 years⁴. Mahānetra⁵ will be resplendent 33 years (or Sumati will next obtain the kingdom 33 years). Sucala will be king 32 years⁶. King Sunetra⁷ will next enjoy the kingdom 40 years. King Satyajit will enjoy the earth 83 years⁸. And Viśvajit will obtain this earth and be 25 years⁹. Ripuñjaya¹⁰ will obtain the earth 50 years.

These 16 kings are to be known as the future Bṛhadrathas; and their kingdom will last 723 years¹¹. And these 32 kings are the future Bṛhadrathas; their kingdom will last full 1000 years indeed.

Pradyotas.

When the Bṛhadrathas, Vītihoṭras and Avantis have passed away, Pulika¹² will kill his master and anoint his own son Pradyota, by force¹³ in the very sight of the kṣatriyas. He (Pradyota) will indeed have the neighbouring kings subject to him and be destitute of good policy¹⁴. He, an excellent man¹⁵, will be king 23 years. Palaka will then be king 24 years¹⁶. Viśākhaṇḍa will be king 50 years¹⁷. Ajaka¹⁸ will have the kingdom 21 years¹⁹. His son Nandivardhana will be 20 years²⁰.

Those 5 kings after enjoying the earth 52 years perished²¹.

Those 5 sons, the Pradyotas, will endure 138 years²².

Śīsunāgas.

Śīsunāga will destroy all their prestige and will be king. Placing his son in Benares he will make Girivraja his own abode²³. Śīsunāga will reign 40 years. His son Kākavarṇa will obtain the earth 36 years²⁴. Kṣemadharman will be king next 20 years²⁵. Kṣatranajas will obtain the earth 40 years²⁶. Vimbisāra will be

¹ Bh Dharmaśūtra. Vṣ, Gr Dharma.

² Vā, Bḍ, merely nṛpati.

³ Bh Śama. Vā Suvrata.

⁴ Mt Dyumatsena. Vā, Bḍ, 58 years, crp.

⁵ Some Mt, merely Netra.

⁶ Mt Acala. Vṣ, Bh, Gr Subala. Vā, 22 years; Bḍ, 40.

⁷ Vṣ Sunīta. Bh Sunītha. Gr Nīta.

⁸ Mt, 80 years.

⁹ Vā Vīrajit, 35 years.

¹⁰ Vā, Bḍ Ariñjaya. Gr Iṣuñjaya.

¹¹ See p. 17, note ⁹⁹.

¹² Vā Munika. Vṣ Sunika. Bḍ, Bh Śunaka.

¹³ Or 'Pulika's offspring'. Mt has the

name Bālaka for Pradyota.

¹⁴ Or (some copies) 'will not act righteously'.

¹⁵ Or (some copies) 'sickly in mind'.

¹⁶ Mt, 28 years.

¹⁷ Mt, 53 years.

¹⁸ Bh Rājaka. Vṣ Janaka. Mt Sūryaka.

¹⁹ Vā, 31 years.

²⁰ Vā Vartivardhana. Mt, 30 years.

²¹ So Mt; some copies, 152 years.

²² So Vā, Bḍ, Vṣ, Bh.

²³ So Mt. Vā, Bḍ seem to mean the same.

²⁴ Vā Śakavarṇa. Mt, 26 years.

²⁵ Mt, 36 years.

²⁶ Bh Kṣetrajña. Mt Kṣemajit, 24 years.

40
36
20
40
20
25

25

33

40

43

33 0

EARLY CONTEMPORARY DYNASTIES AND NANDAS 69

king 28 years¹. Ajātasatru will be king 25 years². Darśaka will be king 25 years³. After him Udayin⁴ will be king 33 years. That king will make as his capital on the earth Kaśmapura on the south bank of the Ganges in his fourth year⁵. Nandivardhana will be king 40 years⁶. Mahānandin⁷ will be 43 years.

These will be the 10 Saiśunāga kings⁸. The Śiśunāgas will endure 360 (or better, 163⁹) years, being kings with kṣatriya kinsfolk.

Early Contemporary Dynasties.

Contemporaneous with these *aforsaid* kings there will be other kings; all these *following* kings will endure an equal time: namely, 24 Aikṣvākus¹⁰, 27 Pañcālas¹¹, 24 kings of Kāśi, 28 Haihayas¹², 32 Kaliṅgas, 25 Aśmakas, 36 Kurus¹³, 28 Maithilas, 23 Śūrasenas, and 20 Vitihotras. All these kings will endure the same time.

Nandas.

As son of Mahānandin by a śūdra woman will be born a king¹⁴, Mahāpadma (Nanda¹⁵), who will exterminate all kṣatriyas. Thereafter kings will be of śūdra origin. Mahāpadma will be sole monarch, bringing all under his sole sway¹⁶. He will be 88 years on the earth¹⁷. He will uproot all kṣatriyas¹⁸, being urged on by prospective fortune¹⁹. He will have 8 sons, of whom Sukalpa²⁰ will be the first; and they will be kings in succession to Mahāpadma for 12 years.

A brahman Kautilya will uproot them all; and, after they have enjoyed the earth 100 years, it will pass to the Mauryas.

¹ All vary in this name. Bḍ 38 years. After him Mt erroneously inserts the first two Kāṇvāyana kings: see *Kāṇvāyanas*, *infra*.

² Mt, 27 years.

³ Bḍ, Vṣ, Bh *Darbhaka*. Mt *Vaiśaka*, 24 years.

⁴ Vṣ *Udayāśva*. Mt *Udāsin*. Bh *Ajaya*.

⁵ This statement is in Vā, Bḍ.

⁶ Vā, 42 years.

⁷ Bḍ *Sahānandi*.

⁸ Many copies of Mt say 12, because of the mistake mentioned in note¹.

⁹ So Mt according to its real meaning apptly: corrupted by Bḍ and Bh to 360; by Vā and Vṣ to 362.

¹⁰ For their list, see p. 65.

¹¹ Vā, Bḍ, 25.

¹² Vā, Bḍ, 24.

¹³ For their list, see p. 64, prob.

¹⁴ Mt says apptly, he will be 'born as a portion of Kali'. Vā and Bḍ say, he will be 'enveloped by Fate'.

¹⁵ So Vṣ and Bh.

¹⁶ Vṣ, Bh, 'his rule will be untransgressed'.

¹⁷ Vā, Bḍ, 'he will protect the earth 88 (or some copies, 28) years'.

¹⁸ Vṣ, Bh, 'like a second Paraśu-Rāma'.

¹⁹ Vā, Bḍ, 'urged on by predestination', apptly.

²⁰ Or *Sakalya*. Vṣ *Sumātya*. Bh *Sumālyā*.

Mauryas.

Kauṭilya will anoint Candragupta as king in the realm. Candragupta will be king 24 years¹. Vindusāra will be king 25 years². Aśoka will be king 36 years. His son Kunāla will reign 8 years³.

Mt and eVā.

- ✓ Kunāla's son Bandhupālita will enjoy the kingdom 8 years⁴. Their grandson
 3 Daśona will reign 7 years⁴. His son
 4 Daśaratha will be king 8 years. His son
 5 Samprati will reign 9 years. Śāliśūka
 will be king 13 years⁵. Devadharman
 will be king 7 years⁵. His son Śata-
 8 dhanvan will be king 8 years⁶. Brhad-
 9 ratha will reign 70 years⁸.

These are the 10 Mauryas⁹ who will enjoy the earth full 137 years. After them it will go to the Śuṅgas¹⁰.

Vā genly and Bḍ.

Kunāla's son Bandhupālita will enjoy the kingdom 8 years. Bandhupālita's heir Indrapālita will reign 10 years.

6 Devavarman will be king 7 years. His son Śatadhanus will be king 8 years. Bṛhadratha will be king 7 years⁷.

These 9 Mauryas will enjoy the earth full 137 years. After them will go the Śuṅga¹¹

Śuṅgas.

1 Puṣyamitra the commander-in-chief will uproot Bṛhadratha and will rule the kingdom as king 36 years¹². His son Agnimitra will be king 8 years. Vasujyēṣṭha¹³ will be king 7 years. His son Vasumitra will be king 10 years. Then his son Andhraka¹⁴ will reign 2 years. Pulindaka will then reign 3 years. His son Ghoṣa¹⁵ will be king 3 years. Next Vajramitra will be king 9 years¹⁶. Bhāgavata¹⁷ will be king 32 years. His son Devabhūmi¹⁸ will reign 10 years.

These 10 Śuṅga kings will enjoy this earth full 112 years. From them the earth will pass to the Kaṇvas.

¹ Mt wants this statement.

² Mt omits. All except Vṣ vary this name.

³ Mt omits. Vṣ, Bh mention *Suyāsa* instead.

⁴ Mt, 'his (i.e. Aśoka's) grandson', but the text is crp.

⁵ Mt wants this statement.

⁶ So also Vṣ, Bh: eVā Śatadhanuṣ. Mt, 6 years.

⁷ Vā *Vṛhadaśva*, but *Vṛhadratha* at beginning of next dynasty.

⁸ So Mt genly; eVā, 87.

⁹ So also Vṣ, Bh: eVā, 9.

¹⁰ But eVā, 'after them will be the Śuṅga

¹¹ Or, 'the earth will go to the Śuṅgas'.

¹² Vā, Bḍ, 60 years.

¹³ Vā, Bḍ, Vṣ, Bh *Sujyēṣṭha*.

¹⁴ Mt *Antaka*. Bḍ, Bh *Bhadra-ka*. Vṣ *Ādraka*.

¹⁵ Vṣ *Ghoṣavasū*. Mt crp *Yomegha*.

¹⁶ Bḍ, 7 years. Vā no term.

¹⁷ Mt *Samābhāga* aptly, but text crp.

¹⁸ Vā *Kṣemabhūmi* here, but *Devabhūmi* in next dynasty.

Kāṇvāyanas (Śuṅgabhrtyas).

The minister Vasudeva, forcibly overthrowing the dissolute king Devabhūmi because of his youth, will become king among the Śuṅgas¹. He, the Kāṇvāyana, will be king 9 years². His son Bhūmimitra will reign 14 years³. His son Nārāyaṇa will reign 12 years. His son Suśarman will reign 10 years⁴.

These are remembered as the Śuṅgabhrtya Kāṇvāyana kings. These 4 Kāṇva brahmans will enjoy the earth; for 45 years they will enjoy this earth. They will have the neighbouring kings in subjection and will be righteous. In succession to them the earth will pass to the Andhras.

*Śisuka**Andhras. Śisuka*

The Andhra *Simuka*⁵ with his fellow tribesmen, the servants of Suśarman, will assail the Kāṇvāyanas and him (Suśarman), and destroy the remains of the Śuṅgas' power and will obtain this earth. *Simuka* will be king 23 years. His younger brother *Kṛṣṇa* will next reign 10 years⁶. His son Śrī-Śātakarṇi will reign 10 years⁷. Then Pūrṇotsaṅga will be king 18 years⁸. Skandhastambhi will be king 18 years⁸. Śātakarṇi will reign 56 years; his son Lambodara 18 years⁸. His son Āpīlaka⁹ will reign 12 years. Meghasvāti will reign 18 years⁸. Svāti will be king 18 years¹⁰. Skandasvāti will be king 7 years⁸. Mṛgendra Svātikarṇa will reign 3 years⁸. Kuntala Svātikarṇa will be king 8 years⁸. Svātikarṇa will be king one year⁸. Pulomāvi will reign 36 years¹¹. Ariṣṭakarṇa¹² will reign 25 years. Then Hāla will be king 5 years¹³. Mantalaka¹⁴ will be a powerful king 5 years. Purikaṣeṇa will reign 21 years¹⁵. Sundara Śātakarṇi will reign one year. Cakora Śātakarṇi will reign 6 months. Śivasvāti will reign 28 years. King Gautamīputra will be king next 21 years. His son Pulomā¹⁶ will reign 28 years⁸. [Śātakarṇi will be king 29 years¹⁷.] Śivaśrī Pulomā¹⁸ will be king 7 years⁸. His son Śivaskandha Śātakarṇi will be king three¹⁹ years⁸. Yajñaśrī Śātakarṇika will reign 29 years²⁰.

¹ Mt, 'will become the Śauṅga king'.

² Bd, 5 years.

³ Vā, Bd, 24 years.

⁴ Bd, 4 years.

⁵ This is the name emended. Mt *Śisuka*.
Vā, Bd *Sindhuka*. Vṣ *Śipraka*.

⁶ Mt, 18 years.

⁷ Vā, Bd, no number.

⁸ This sentence is not in Vā genly nor Bd.

⁹ Much variation in this name.

¹⁰ Or *Āti*, 12 years. Not in Vā, Bd.

¹¹ Vā, Bd, 24 years. Much variation in

this name.

¹² Much variation in this name.

¹³ Vā, Bd, one year.

¹⁴ Or *Pattalaka*. Bh *Talaka*. Vā *Saptaka*.

¹⁵ Mt *Purindrasena*, but no number.

¹⁶ Properly *Pulomāvi*.

¹⁷ A doubtful line found only in eVā.

¹⁸ Or 'after Puloma Śivaśrī'.

¹⁹ Conjectural emendation; no number mentioned.

²⁰ Vā, Bd, 19 years.

After him Vijaya will be king 6 years. His son Caṇḍasrī Sātakarpi will reign 10 years¹. Another² of them Pulomāvi will reign 7 years.

These 30 Andhra kings³ will enjoy the earth 460 years⁴.

Various Local Dynasties.

When the kingdom of the Andhras has come to an end *there will be* kings belonging to the lineage of their servants: 7 Āndhras⁵, and 10 Ābhīra kings; also 7 Gardabhins⁶, 18 Śakas⁷. There will be 8 Yavanas, 14 Tuṣāras⁸, 13 Murundas⁹, 11 Maunas¹⁰.

The Śrīparvatīya Āndhras will endure 52 years¹¹; the 10 Ābhīra kings 67 years; the 7 Gardabhins will enjoy the earth 72 years¹²; the 18 Śakas¹³ 183 years. The 8 Yavanas¹⁴ will enjoy this earth 87 years¹⁴. The earth is remembered as belonging to the Tuṣāras 7000 years¹⁵. The 13 future Murundas¹⁶ along with low caste men, all of Mleccha origin, will enjoy it half 400 years¹⁷. The 11 Maunas will enjoy it 103 years¹⁸. When they are overthrown by Time there will be Kilakila kings¹⁹.

Then after the Kilakilas Vindhyaśakti²⁰ will reign. He will enter upon the earth after it has known those kings 96 years²¹.

शका
मोपज

Dynasties of Vidiśā, &c.

Hear also the future kings of Vidiśā. Bhogin son of the Nāga king (Sesa) will be king, conqueror of his enemies' cities²², a king who will exalt the (Nāga family) Sadācandra²³, and Candrāmśa who will be a second Nakhavant²⁴, then Dhanadharmar²⁵,

¹ Vā, Bḍ *Dandaśrī*, 3 years.

² Or 'the last'.

³ Mt. 19.

⁴ Bḍ, 456; Vā crp, but aptly the same.

⁵ Bh and Vṣ *Andhra-bhrtyas*.

⁶ Or *Gardabhilas*.

⁷ Vā, Bḍ, 10. Bh, Vṣ, 16. Bh calls them *Kaikas*.

⁸ Or *Tukhāras* or *Tuṣkaras*.

⁹ Mt, Bḍ, Bh *Gurundas*. Vṣ *Mundas* (for *Murundas*).

¹⁰ Vā genly, 18. Mt, 19 *Hūnas*.

¹¹ Or possibly 'twice 50'. Vā, Bḍ crp but probably 112 or 102.

¹² Mt *Gardabhilas*, but no term.

¹³ Vā and Bḍ no number.

¹⁴ Vā and Bḍ, 82.

¹⁵ Vā, Bḍ, 500; but prob 107 and 105 are meant respectively.

¹⁶ See note⁹.

¹⁷ That is, 200 years; Vṣ, Bh say 199. Vā, Bḍ erroneously, 350.

¹⁸ Mt *Hūnas*.

¹⁹ Vṣ says they were Yavanas.

²⁰ Vṣ says he was a Kilakila.

²¹ This seems to be the meaning; but literally, 'he after having known 96 years will enter upon the earth'. But perhaps *samasyati* may mean 'he will come to an end' (= *samsthāsyati*, see p. 8, note²³), for, though *sam-i* does not have that meaning, yet *samaya* has it. The sentence would then be, 'After having known the earth 96 years he will come to his end.'

²² Vṣ treats the word *purañjaya* as his name.

²³ Vṣ *Rāmacandra*.

²⁴ Or 'Nakhapāna's offspring' in eVā.

²⁵ Vṣ *Dharma*.

DYNASTIES OF THE THIRD CENTURY, A.D. 73

and Vaṅgara¹ is remembered as the fourth. Then Bhūtinanda will reign in the Vaidiśa kingdom.

When the family of the Śuṅgas² ends, Śiśunandi³ will reign. His younger brother was named Nandiyāśas⁴. In his lineage there will be 3 kings. His daughter's son named Śiśuka was king in Purikā.

Vindhyāśakti's valiant son, named Pravira, will enjoy the city Kāñcanakā 60 years, and will sacrifice with vājapeya sacrifices replete with choice largesse. His 4 sons will be kings. Puri

Dynasties of the Third Century, A.D.

When the family of the Vindhyakas has passed away, there will be 3 Bāhlika kings. Supratika and Nabhira⁵ will enjoy the earth 30 years. Śakyamāna⁶ was king of the Mahiṣis. There will be 13 Puṣyamitras⁷ and Paṭumitras⁸. In Mekalā 7 kings⁹ will reign 70 years. In Kosalā there will be 9 very powerful and wise kings celebrated as 'Meghas'. All the kings of Niśadha¹⁰, born in the family of Nala, valiant and very powerful, will exist till the termination of the Manus¹¹.

Of the Māgadhas the king will be very valiant Viśvasphāni¹². Overthrowing all kings he will make other castes kings, namely, Kaivartas, Pañcakas¹³, Pulindas, and brahmans. He will establish those persons as kings in various countries. Viśvasphāni the magnificent will be mighty, Viṣṇu's peer in battle¹⁴. King Viśvasphāni is called eunuch-like in appearance. Overthrowing the kṣatriya caste he will create another kṣatriya caste. After gratifying the gods, the pitṛs and brahmans once and again, he will resort to the bank of the Ganges and subdue his body; after resigning his body he will go to Indra's world.

Contemporary Dynasties of the Early Fourth Century. Nāgas

Nine Naka¹⁵ kings will enjoy the city Campāvati; and 7 Nāgas will enjoy the charming city Mathurā. Kings born of the Gupta race will enjoy all these territories, namely, along the Ganges, Prayāga, Sāketa, and the Magadhas. Kings born from Maṇidhānya¹⁶ will enjoy all these territories, namely, the Naiśadhas, Yadukas, Śaiśitas¹⁷, and Kālatoyakas. The Devarakṣitas will enjoy the Kośalas, Andhras¹⁸,

¹ Bh Vaṅgiri. Vṣ Varāṅga. Vā Viṃśaja.
Bd, 'born in the race'.

² Many Vā Āṅgas.

³ Vṣ genly Śuśinandi. Vā Madhun.

⁴ Bh Yaśonandi.

⁵ Bd Gabhira.

⁶ Bd Śaṅkamāna.

⁷ Or Puṣpamitras. Bh names one of them as Durmitra.

⁸ Vṣ adds Padmamitras.

⁹ Bh says Andhras.

¹⁰ Bh calls them 'lords of Vaidūra' also.

¹¹ Or perhaps, 'as long as Manu's race'.

¹² Bh Viśvasphūrji. Vṣ Viśvasphatika.

¹³ Bd Madrakas. Vṣ Yadus. Bh both.

¹⁴ Bh says his city will be Padmavati.

¹⁵ So Vā; but Bd, Vṣ Nāgas.

¹⁶ Vṣ Maṇidhāra.

¹⁷ Or Śaiśijas or Śaiśikas. Vṣ Naimiśikas.

¹⁸ Vṣ Odras.

538
and Paundras, the Tāmraliptas and coast-folk and the charming city Campā¹. Guha will protect all these territories, *namely*, the Kalingas, Mahiṣas, and the inhabitants of the Mahendra mountains. He who is named Kanaka will enjoy Strirāṣṭra² and the Bhoksyakas³. The Saurāṣṭras, Āvantiyas and Abhīras, the Sūdras⁴, Arbudas and Mālavas⁵, *there* the kings will be outcaste dvijas and non-dvijas, *mostly* sūdras. Sūdras, outcaste dvijas and others, and Mlecchas destitute of Vedic holiness will enjoy the Sindhu's bank, the Candrabhāgā, Kaunti⁶ and the Kāśmīra realm.

All these kings will be contemporaneous, niggards in graciousness, untruthful, very irascible and unrighteous.

Dārvikorvī

Evils of the Kali Age.

There will be Yavanas here by reason of religious feeling *or* ambition *or* plunder; they will not be kings solemnly anointed, but will follow evil customs by reason of the corruption of the age. Massacring women and children⁷ and killing one another, kings will enjoy the earth at the end of the Kali age. Kings of continual upstart races, falling as soon as they arise, will exist in succession through Fate. They will be destitute of righteousness, affection, and wealth. Mingled with them will be Ārya and Mleccha folk everywhere⁸: they prevail in turn; the population will perish.

Chronological and Astronomical Particulars.

All the Purāṇas.

When the moon and the sun and the constellation Tīṣya and Bṛhaspati shall come together in the same zodiacal sign, then may the Kṛta age be.

This is the entire series of genealogies which has been declared in due order—the kings who have passed away, and those who exist *now*, and those who are future.

Now from Mahāpadma's⁹ inauguration to Parīkṣit's birth, this interval is indeed known as 1050 years¹⁰. Moreover in the interval which elapsed from the last Andhra king Pulomāvi to Mahāpadma—that interval was 836 years. An equal space of time is still future; subsequent kings beginning from the end of the

¹ Vṣ Samudratata-purī.

² Or Strirājya.

³ Bḍ Bhojakas. Vṣ Mūṣikas.

⁴ Or Sūras.

⁵ Vṣ Marubhūmi.

⁶ Vṣ Dārvikorvī in various forms.

⁷ Bh adds 'cattle and brahmins'; and

says 'they will ravish other people's wives and riches'. Vṣ similarly.

⁸ Vṣ adds 'they will be audacious through royal support'.

⁹ Bḍ Mahānanda. Vṣ, Bh Nanda. Vā Mahādeva.

¹⁰ Vṣ, Bh, 1015 years.

CHRONOLOGICAL AND ASTRONOMICAL PARTICULARS 75

Andhras are declared *therein*. They have been enumerated in the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa by śrutarsis who knew the ancient stories.

The Great Bear¹ was situated equally with regard to the lunar constellation Puṣya² while Pratīpa³ was king. At the end of the Andhras, who will be in the 27th century *afterwards*, the cycle repeats itself⁴. In the circle of the lunar constellations, wherein the Great Bear revolves⁵, and which contains 27 constellations in its circumference⁶, the Great Bear remains 100 years in (*i.e.* conjoined with) each in turn. This is the Cycle of the Great Bear, and is remembered as being, according to divine reckoning, 6 divine months and 7 divine years. According to those constellations divine time proceeds by means of the Great Bear. The two front stars of the Great Bear, which are seen when risen at night⁷, the lunar constellation which is seen *situated* equally between them in the sky⁸, the Great Bear is to be known as conjoined with that constellation 100 years in the sky. This is the exposition of the conjunction of the lunar constellations and the Great Bear. The Great Bear was conjoined with the Maghās in Parikṣit's time 100 years. It will be in (*i.e.* conjoined with) the 24th constellation⁹ 100 years at the termination of the Andhras.

Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata.

The Great Bear was in (*i.e.* conjoined with) the Maghās in Parikṣit's time; then began the Kali age comprising 1200 *divine* years¹⁰. When the portion of the lord Viṣṇu, which was born in Vasudeva's family and named Kṛṣṇa, went to heaven, then the Kali age set in. As long as he touched the earth with his lotus-feet, so long the Kali age could not encompass the earth. When that portion of the eternal Viṣṇu had departed from earth to heaven, Dharma's son Yudhiṣṭhira with his younger brothers relinquished his kingdom. That Pāṇḍava, beholding the adverse omens when Kṛṣṇa had departed, performed Parikṣit's inauguration. When the Great Bear will pass from the Maghās to Pūrvā Āṣādhā, then, starting from Nanda¹¹, || 28

¹ Called the 'Seven Rishis'.

² Or 'was in (*i.e.* conjoined with) Puṣya 100 years'. These readings are emendations, see p. 59, note ⁴⁰.

³ Ancestor of Parikṣit in the seventh degree, see JRAS, 1910, p. 28.

⁴ This statement read with the preceding statements would imply that some 814 years are allowed for the interval between Pratīpa and Parikṣit: thus Pratīpa to Parikṣit 814 years, Parikṣit to Mahāpadma Nanda 1050 years, Mahāpadma to the last Andhra king 836 years—total 2700 years. Thus the period from Pratīpa to the end of the Andhras comprised a complete cycle of the Great Bear, and then the cycle began again.

⁵ So Mt: explained in subsequent statements.

⁶ So Vā, Bd.

⁷ Or 'in the sky'; or 'in the northern region'.

⁸ That is, according to the commentators, 'the constellation which is situated equally on a line drawn south and north between the two front stars (the two Pointers) of the Great Bear'.

⁹ Apptly, either no. 24 in the order of reckoning the lunar constellations, or the 24th after the Maghās.

¹⁰ Including the twilights.

¹¹ That is, the Great Bear was conjoined with Pūrvā Āṣādhā in (Mahāpadma Nanda's time/

76 CHRONOLOGICAL AND ASTRONOMICAL PARTICULARS

All the Purāṇas.

On the very day, on which Kṛṣṇa departed to heaven, the Kali age arrived. .
Hear its reckoning. It is remembered by the wise, as computed according to human
reckoning, to be 360,000 years¹ or 1000 divine years. Then the twilight sets in.
When that is completely finished, the Kṛta age will then arrive.

¹ Mt, 460,000 years.

APPENDIX I

The Account was originally in Prakrit.

Proof is offered here of the statement made in the Introduction, § 15, that the Sanskrit account as it stands in the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa is a Sanskritized version of older Prakrit śloka, as indicated by these peculiarities: *first*, certain passages violate the śloka metre, whereas in Prakrit form they would satisfy the metre; *secondly*, certain Prakrit forms actually occur, especially where they are required by the metre, which the corresponding Sanskrit forms would violate; *thirdly*, Sanskrit words occur at times in defiance of syntax, whereas the corresponding Prakrit forms would make the construction correct; *fourthly*, mistaken Sanskritization of names and words; *fifthly*, the copious use of expletive particles; *sixthly*, irregular sandhi. Those three Purāṇas will be dealt with first, and along with them such portions also of the Bhāgavata and Viṣṇu as have preserved the old śloka uncondensed; but the main portions of these two Purāṇas consist almost entirely of a condensed redaction, and their character will be considered afterwards.

i. As an illustration of the first peculiarity, the Mt and Vā¹, when naming the last Paurava king, end the line thus (p. 7)—*Nirāmitrāt tu* (or *ca*) *Kṣemakāḥ*, 'after Nirāmitra was Kṣemaka'; where the *tu* or *ca* in the fifth syllable should be short but is long by position before *kṣ*. No one composing in Skt could end a śloka line with *Kṣemaka*, but its Pkt form *Khemaka* satisfies the metre perfectly. There can be no doubt therefore that this line was composed in Pkt originally, and that the Skt redactor restored the Pkt name to its Skt form and in so doing overlooked the fact that the change violated the metre. The fault was however noticed afterwards, because *eVā* corrects it by altering the half line to *bhavitā Kṣemakas tathā* (p. 7, note ⁷¹). Precisely similar is the mistake in the line that ends with *samā bhokṣyanti trīṃśatim*², where no difficulty would occur in Pkt since *trīṃśati* would drop its *r* there³.

Again the Mt reads at the end of a śloka line, *aṣṭāvimśatir Haihayāḥ*⁴, where the fifth syllable is long by position contrary to rule; and here the literary Pkt form *viśati* without a termination would fit the metre. The Vā and Bḍ read instead *caturvimśat* (or *-vimśas*) *tu Haihayāḥ* and avoid the irregularity by reducing *vimśati*

¹ The Bḍ has lost this line in a large lacuna.

² P. 50 (*Dynasties of the 3rd Cent.*), l. 2; the differences of reading there do not affect this point.

³ The phrase *ā-Manu-kṣayāt* in the Vā and Bḍ at the end of a line (p. 51, l. 8) does

not militate against this view, because the *kṣ* in the middle of this expression would have been *kkh* in Pkt.

⁴ P. 23, l. 4: *ḍMt* avoids the fault by reading *aṣṭāvimśati*, keeping as near to Pkt as possible.

to *viṃśat* or *viṃśa* and replacing the lost syllable by a superfluous *tu*, which is the nearest approach to it. This expedient is very common as will be seen in the notes.

Next may be cited cases where a half line has a syllable too much, which would disappear in Pkt, and the significance of these cases lies in the fact that the superfluity was unnecessary since good Skt equivalents were available, if the verse had been composed directly in Skt. Thus the Bh has a śloka prophesying Viṣṇu's incarnation as Kalki thus—

dharma-trāṇāya sattvena Bhagavān avatariṣyati¹.

The second half line has a syllable too much, but the Pkt verb *otarissati* would exactly suit the metre and was no doubt the word used originally, as dBh (an old MS of 1407) shows by reading *Bhagavān vatarissati*, where *n* and *va* are separate letters. Many two-syllabled equivalents for *bhagavān* were available to suit the metre. Again eVā has for the first half of a line, *sapta varṇaṇi Devadharmā*², where *varṇaṇi* is obviously a misreading of *varṣāṇi*, and there is a syllable too much; but the Pkt form *varṣā* or *vassā* satisfies the metre. To one composing in Skt *samāh* would have avoided all difficulty. Similarly ūMt has the first half of a line, *aṣṭāvimsati tathā varṣā* with a syllable too much³, but the Pkt *aṭṭhāviṣaṁ* would rectify the metre; whereas one composing in Skt could have written simply *aṣṭāvimsati-varṣāṇi*, which is indeed the general reading of the Mt now. This instance may give us an insight into the process of Sanskritization, if, as the ūMt reading suggests, the original Pkt was *aṭṭhāviṣaṁ tathā vassā*.

ii. Actual Pkt forms occur rather often. First may be cited the Vā and Bḍ line⁴—

sthāpayiṣyati rājāno nānā-deśeṣu te janā :

where *rājāno* and *te janā* are Pkt accusatives after the verb. They were misunderstood as nominatives, and the verb was altered to the plural in all copies of the Vā except eVā, and in the Bḍ. Similarly the Bh introduces the Bārhadratha dynasty with the old line⁵—

atha Māgadha-rājāno bhavitāro vadāmi te.

Here *rājāno* and *bhavitāro* are accusatives, hence the line is not Skt but is actually good Pali. BrBh correct the faults by altering *bhavitāro* to *bhāvino ye*. Again the Mt has a half line *prasahya hy avanīm nrpaḥ* in many copies, and *prasahya vyasanī nrpam* in some copies, while the corresponding reading of the Vā and Bḍ is *bālyād vyasaninam nrpam*⁶. The Mt reading should evidently be *prasahya vyasanīm nrpam*, and points to a Pkt original something like *pasajjha* (or *pasayha*) *vasanīm*⁷ *napam*; but this when Sanskritized became *prasahya vyasaninam nrpam* with a syllable too much, and so was adjusted in two ways, (1) the half-Pkt form *vyasanīm* was used as an accus. in many copies and became corrupted to *hy avanīm*; or (2) the half line was emended to *prasahya vyasandturam* in some copies. The Vā and Bḍ may have substituted *bālyād* (or *balād*?) for *prasahya* to rectify the metre.

Next may be cited a number of actual Pkt or half-Pkt words. All such forms cannot be deemed original, because the copyists, who were not always sufficiently literate, did write Pkt forms sometimes instead of Skt forms, but such deviations are

¹ Bh xii, 2, 16; omitted from p. 57.

² P. 29, l. 11, and note³⁸.

³ P. 19, note²⁶.

⁴ P. 52, l. 13 and notes.

⁵ P. 14, note¹.

⁶ P. 33, note².

⁷ This would be the correct accus. in Pkt, see Pischel's Prakrit Grammar, § 405.

THE ACCOUNT ORIGINALLY IN PRAKRIT

79

trivial and obvious mistakes¹. It is different however when the Pkt forms violate grammar or sandhi, or suit the metre, and such are these—*uccādayitvā* (p. 53, note ⁵²), *mahāyāsāḥ* as a nomin. plural² (p. 51, note ²⁵) and *varṣā* (see p. 78). There are also instances of the Pkt genit. plural in *āna* (p. 35, note ⁴¹), and of its blending with *ante* into *ānānte*, namely *kulānānte* (p. 50, note ²) and *Andhrānānte* (p. 59, notes ⁵¹, ⁵⁴; p. 61, note ⁵²). Other words appear to be Pkt survivals and not copyists' errors, such as *aṭṭirīmśat* (p. 19, note ⁴¹), *athōchādya* (p. 34, note ³), *teṣācchannesu* (p. 48, note ⁸²), *samā* for *samās* before *tasmāt* in Vā genly (p. 34, note ¹⁸), and *Asakāḥ* in Vā and Bḍ (p. 24, note ¹⁵). In an old verse Bḍ has *papannān uharisṣyati* (p. 26, note ³⁶), which seems more than a mere clerical error. Mistakes precisely like these are found in Buddhist Skt.

The Bhāgavata has an old verse—

yasmin Kṛṣṇo divaṁ yātas tasminn eva tadāhani
pratipannam Kaliyugam iti prāhuḥ purāvidaḥ.

The Mt, Vā, Bḍ, and Vṣ all have this verse, but read the last half line *tasya saṅkhyāṁ nibodhata* or in equivalent words³. The Bh reading appears to be the oldest version, because its verse is complete in itself and is obviously an old saying, whereas the last half line in the other authorities was evidently substituted to connect this statement with the following verse when this collective account was drawn up: the reverse is hardly credible. Further, one old Bh MS (dBh, dated 1407) reads *iti-r-āhuḥ purāvidaḥ*, and this with its euphonic Pkt *r* is no doubt the original form, which in the process of Sanskritization was amended to *iti prāhuḥ* as in all the other Bh copies; here also the reverse is hardly credible. *Iti-r-āhuḥ* is the Pkt *iti-r-āhu*⁴. There are one or two other instances of an *r* inserted, which seems to be euphonic⁵; and it may possibly be that the final *r* in the nominatives of numerals is sometimes as much a euphonic Pkt *r* as a Skt *r* by sandhi⁶.

Similarly no doubt are to be explained the Bḍ reading of p. 62, l. 40 and the Vā readings in note ³¹ thereto. The reading in literary Pkt would have been something like *vassāna uccate Kali* or rather *vassāna-r-uccate Kali*. Turned into Skt, *varṣānām ucyate Kalīḥ* was good and sufficient, yet notwithstanding, the desire for an expedient to prevent the hiatus persisted in the Sanskritization, for *mVā* has preserved the euphonic *r*, and *bḍṣVā* inserted *tu* instead. These were no doubt the original forms of the Sanskritizations, but it was perceived that no such expedient was wanted, hence most copies of the Vā dropped it. The reverse is not credible.

Most common is the use of numerals with the Pkt freedom from case-terminations, as well as only half Sanskritized, such as—*aṣṭāṣīti* and *aṣṭāṣīti*⁷, and *vimśati* often both in the text and in the notes. Some of these instances might be due to the carelessness of copyists in omitting visarga or anusvāra, but that does not account for all such peculiarities, since they are found in carefully written MSS and are sometimes obligatory for the sake of the metre. Thus the Vā and Bḍ read as the last half line of a śloka, *aṣṭāvimśati Maithilāḥ*⁸, and this was no doubt the

¹ E.g. see p. 2, note ¹⁶; p. 43, note ²⁷; and these are found even in Bh MSS, see p. 46, note ²⁷.

² This is possible only in r'kt and does actually occur, see Pischel, *op. cit.* § 409.

³ P. 62, ll. 37, 38 and notes.

⁴ See Pischel's Prakrit Grammar, §§ 353, 518.

⁵ See *hatva-r* in p. 38, note ².

⁶ As in p. 43, l. 36, where the accusative would be proper.

⁷ P. 25, l. 5 and note ¹⁷.

⁸ P. 24, l. 6.

original reading because *fgMt* have it also; but the *Mt* has generally altered *vimśati* to *vimśās* (or *śat* or *śa*) *tu*. The *Skt* form *vimśatir* would violate the metre, and the *Mt* has avoided the difficulty of Sanskritization by substituting *tu* for the final syllable. This is the converse of the first irregularity noticed above (p. 78), and many similar instances of *tu* substituted for a final *ti* will be found in the notes.

iii. Of the third class of peculiarities the following are instances. As the last half line of a śloka the *Vā* and *Bd* have in one place *varṣāṇi bhavitā trayah*¹, and in another *tasya putrah samās trayah*²; and the *Mt* has in another place *bhaviṣyati samās trayah*³. In all these passages grammatical concord is violated, because (1) these are accus. expressions denoting duration of time, and (2) *varṣāṇi* is neuter, *samās* feminine, and *trayah* masculine and nomin.; but, if the *Pkt* *tao* be substituted for *trayah*, concord is established, because *tao* is both nomin. and accus. in all three genders⁴, and the metre also is satisfied. Such expressions could not have been composed in *Skt* originally. There can be no doubt that they were originally in *Pkt* and that, when the verses were Sanskritized, the exigencies of metre induced the redactor to convert *tao* into *trayah*, because the correct equivalents *trīṇi* and *tisrah* would not suit the metre⁵.

The same fault occurs in places where metre was not at stake. Thus all three *Purāṇas* read *catvāriṃśat trayas caiva* as the first half of a line⁶, where *samās* or *varṣāṇi* is implied and *trayas* is wrong as regards both gender and case. *CVā* attempts to rectify the discord by reading *trayam*. Similarly in another passage the *Mt* has *samās trīṇy evam*, while the *Vā* and *Bd* read *samās tisra eva*⁷. It is impossible to suppose that these wrong expressions were composed originally in *Skt*, and they are intelligible as perfunctory Sanskritizations of *Pkt* expressions containing the numeral *tao*, or *tiṇṇi* which also is of all three genders⁸. Similarly we find the phrase *ṣaṣṭy-uttara-śata-trayam* used with *varṣāṇi* in the *Bd* and with *samāh* in the *Bh*⁹. Other instances are *saptasṣṭis tu varṣāṇi*¹⁰, and *aṣṭāṣṭis tu varṣāṇi*¹¹, where the case is wrong; *ye cānye Mleccha-jātayah*¹² which *eVā* has corrected to *yās cānyā*: and perhaps *divyābdāni*¹³ where the correct *divyābdās* was as easy as in the *Bd*.

iv. Some forms of names look strange as *Skt* but are readily intelligible if they are mistaken Sanskritizations of *Pkt* forms. Thus the name *Śiśunāga* as found in the *Bd*, *Vs*, and *Bh* appears as *Śiśunāka* in the *Mt* and *Vā*¹⁴. *Śiśunāga* as *Pkt* might naturally be Sanskritized as *Śiśunāka*, because a *Pkt* *g* often represents a *Skt* *k*: otherwise it is difficult to see how the form *Śiśunāka* could have arisen. Similarly *eVā* has *Śuṅka* and *Śaṅka* for *Śuṅga*¹⁵; *eka-kṣatro* appears instead of *eka-cchatro*, and *eka-kṣatrām* instead of *eka-cchatrām*¹⁶.

¹ P. 32, l. 8. The *Mt* reads correctly *trīṇi varṣāṇi*.

² P. 43, l. 32. The *Mt* reads differently, *samā daśa*.

³ P. 40, l. 15. The *Vā* and *Bd* omit this, except *eVā* which alters it to *samā-trayam*.

⁴ Pischel's *Prakrit Grammar*, § 438.

⁵ Unless he recast the line, which was obviously not attempted, except by *Mt* in the first instance, see note¹.

⁶ P. 22, l. 14 and notes.

⁷ P. 32, l. 7; but *dfgjmMt* alter it to *tisro vai*.

⁸ Pischel's *Prakrit Grammar*, § 438.

⁹ P. 22, note⁴⁶.

¹⁰ P. 46, l. 7.

¹¹ P. 25, note¹⁷.

¹² P. 3, l. 11 and note²⁷.

¹³ P. 60, l. 16 and note⁷⁰.

¹⁴ P. 21, ll. 1, 3; p. 22, ll. 15, 17; and notes thereto.

¹⁵ P. 30, note⁵⁰; p. 32, note⁴⁷; p. 49, note¹⁷.

¹⁶ P. 25, l. 4 and notes^{14, 15}.

THE ACCOUNT ORIGINALLY IN PRAKRIT

81

In this class may be mentioned certain incorrect forms: thus the Vā generally reads *caturas* instead of *catvāras* in p. 34, l. 7 (note ²⁰), where the Pkt *caūro* may have been used as a nomin. though it is strictly accus.¹ So the Mt generally has *catvārimsad* instead of *catvāraś ca* (or *tu*), which would be an intelligible mistake if the Pkt was *cattāri ca*, for *cattāri* though neuter was often used as masculine². The plural verb *bhoksyanti* instead of the dual in p. 50 (*Dynasties of the 3rd Cent.*), l. 2, would be correct in Pkt but not in Skt.

Vernacular names had to be Sanskritized and so developed strange forms; compare for instance *Simuka* in p. 38, note ¹⁷, and other Andhra names.

Attention may also be drawn to p. 59, l. 11, where all the divergent readings are obviously attempts to Sanskritize one and the same original Pkt statement that was puzzling.

v. The fifth class of peculiarities is a very noticeable feature of these texts, namely, the copious use of particles as mere expletives, such as *tu*, *hi*, *ca*, *vai*, &c., and especially *tu*. The lines in which two such particles occur are too numerous to be mentioned, but three and even four are sometimes found in a single line, and the following lines are cited as most illustrative:—

bhavitā cāpi Sujyeṣṭhaḥ sapta varṣāni vai tataḥ³
 Svātis ca bhavitā rājā samās tv aṣṭādaśaiva tu⁴
 Sivaśrīr vai Pulomā tu saptaiva bhavitā nṛpaḥ⁵
 sapta Gardabhinaś cāpi tato 'tha daśa vai Śakāḥ⁶
 trayodaśa Muruṇḍāś ca Maunā hy ekādaśaiva tu⁷
 saptaśaṣṭis tu varṣāni daś-Ābhīrās tathaiva ca⁸
 śatāni trīṇy aśītim ca Śakā hy aṣṭādaśaiva tu⁹
 Pulomās tu tath-Āndhrās tu Mahāpadmāntare punaḥ¹⁰.

One cannot imagine that these verses were composed originally either in Skt or in Pkt with so many expletives, when the authors could easily have improved their verses by employing appropriate words denoting 'reign' or 'exist' or 'relationship'. No one composing in Skt would mar his verse and proclaim his literary poverty by such shifts; but these blemishes are readily intelligible, if the verses were originally in Pkt as chronicles of the past and were converted into Skt prophecies. Future tenses are longer than past tenses, and if they could not be fitted into the place of the past tenses, it would have been natural to substitute expletives. Thus it may be conjectured that the second, fifth, sixth, and seventh lines ended originally with a past verb corresponding to *abhavat* or *abhavan*. Again, Pkt forms are sometimes longer than their Skt equivalents, and the substitution of the latter would have been compensated for by adding an expletive; thus in the third line *Sivaśrīr vai* no doubt stands for the Pkt *Sivasirī*, and in the eighth line *Pulomās tu tath-Āndhrās tu* probably mean the ablat. case and stood originally something like *Pulomādo tath-Āndhrādo*, or *Pulomamhā tath-Āndhramhā*.

It has been noticed above (pp. 78, 80) that the particle *tu* is used sometimes to compensate for the loss of the final syllable of *vimśati* and *triṁśati*. When the full forms of these words vitiated the metre, they were reduced sometimes to *vimśat*

¹ Pischel's Prakrit Grammar, § 439.

² P. 35, note ²⁰. Pischel, § 439.

³ P. 31, l. 4, Vā and Bd.

⁴ P. 40, l. 13, Mt.

⁵ P. 42, l. 29, Mt and eVā.

⁶ P. 45, note ¹², Vā and Bd.

⁷ P. 46, l. 5, Vā and Bd.

⁸ P. 46, l. 7, Mt.

⁹ P. 46, l. 9, Mt.

¹⁰ P. 58, l. 7, Mt.

M

APPENDIX I

or *vinśa*, and *trīṃśat* or *trīṃśa* and the lost syllable was replaced by an expletive *tu*. This expedient is very common and many instances of it will be found in the notes. Indeed it is hardly too much to say that the occurrence of *tu* throughout the account, if not required by euphony (see next para.), almost certainly indicates a lost syllable, and in many cases *tu* in the Mt and *eVā* has been altered to *ca* in the Vā and Bḍ as an improvement. Other instances of compensatory expletives may be surmised in the notes, such as these—*Suseṇaś c-Āntarikṣāc ca* (p. 10, l. 13) is hardly explainable unless the second *ca* has replaced the lost syllable of the Pkt ablative; and *Dharmināḥ sa* (p. 11, l. 15) no doubt stands instead of the Pkt genitive *Dharminassa*.

The use of expletives was however carried beyond necessary requirements, and they are often inserted merely to prevent two vowels from coming together, as *tu* in the second of the above-cited lines, and *ky* in the fifth and seventh lines. Skt sandhi did not require this device, but it is intelligible in Pkt. This superfluity is found in the Bh also, where it has not condensed the older ślokas, as in *śūdra-prāyās tv adhārmikāḥ* (p. 25, l. 3).

vi. The instances of irregular sandhi may be divided into two classes; *first*, those in which the form it takes resembles Pkt sandhi and is unnecessary, because regular Skt sandhi would have been proper and sufficient; and *secondly*, those in which it consists of double sandhi in order to contract the words for the metre.

Of the first class may be cited *varṣāni 'kārayat* instead of *varṣāny akārayat* (p. 15, note ²³); *trīṇi 'śitīś* for *trīṇy aśitīś* (p. 46, note ⁴⁸); *Daśarathāśtau* instead of *Daśaratho 'śtau* (p. 28, note ⁵); and *Agnimitrāśtau* for *Agnimitro 'śtau* (p. 31, note ¹⁰). Such sandhi can be explained through Pkt, and it is difficult to understand how any one composing in Skt could have adopted it; nor is it probable as a copyist's error.

The second class is commoner, and we find—*bhaviṣyāśtau* for *bhaviṣyāḥ aśtau* (p. 5, l. 10); *bhaviṣyodayanas* for *bhaviṣyāḥ Udayanas* (p. 7, l. 23); *Yavanāśtau* for *Yavanāḥ aśtau* (p. 45, l. 4; p. 47, l. 10); and *bhāvyānyāḥ* for *bhāvyāḥ anyāḥ* (p. 47, l. 13). Here ordinary sandhi would have given a superfluous syllable, and the double sandhi rectifies the metre; but the significance of it is that it was easily avoidable in Skt, because the first two phrases might have been written *bhāvino 'śtau* and *bhavitṣodayanas*. The simplest explanation seems to be, that the conversion of the Pkt past tense into the Skt future was made perfunctorily, and overloaded the verse with a superfluous syllable which was adjusted by the double sandhi. The third phrase would have been *Yonā atṭha* in Pkt, and the Sanskritization of *Yonā* into *Yavanāḥ* produced the difficulty of the extra syllable. Attempts at improvement were made; see p. 45, note ¹⁶. There are many similar instances, such as *tatōtsāḍya* and *tatōtpātya* (p. 34, notes ³, ⁶); *atōddhrtya* and *tatōddhrtya* (p. 38, note ⁴).

Crisis of this kind is ordinarily explained as *ārṣa-sandhi*, but this explanation is manifestly untenable here ¹. All these irregularities are readily intelligible on the two suppositions, that Pkt words were converted into their Skt equivalents, and that past tenses were changed to futures, with the metrical difficulties that naturally ensued.

vii. All these peculiarities are found in the Mt, Vā, and Bḍ throughout, and show that their version must have been composed originally in Pkt ślokas and that the ślokas were Sanskritized for incorporation in the Bhaviṣya, from which the Mt

¹ In the Purāṇas what is called *ārṣa-sandhi* is really Prakrit sandhi; see p. 20, note ².

and Vā confessedly, and the Bḍ impliedly, borrowed their accounts (see Introdn. § 7). The Prakritisms which have been cited are not mere casual variations, for such might be due to the ignorance or carelessness of copyists, but have an important *raison d'être* in the verse in many cases. The same conclusion holds good for the Vṣ and Bh in the passages where they have preserved the old śloka form.

viii. The main part of the Viṣṇu account is in prose and, not being affected by the exigencies of metre, runs in ordinary Skt, and displays no verbal peculiarities. It contains the same matter found in the Vā and Bḍ but in a condensed shape, and closes its account where they end, so that it must have been composed directly in Skt from them or their original, the revised version in the Bhaviṣya, for it is not probable that its account was a new and independent compilation, when the compilations in those Purāṇas were available. A difference may be noticed in its account to this extent that the dynastic matter is generally narrated in curt sentences, often without regard for sandhi¹, and that the subsequent matter of the evils of the Kali age is in ordinary good prose Skt with a predilection for compound phrases. Hence it would seem that the dynastic portion was an earlier and somewhat crude condensation, and that the latter portion was an addition made with regard to the canons of good prose.

ix. The Bhāgavata account, which is mainly a condensation, is evidently a later redaction. Peculiarities of the kinds noticed above do not appear therein, but it is in good Sanskrit, and phrases occur in it which indicate that it must have been composed directly in Skt. Two are especially significant. A śloka line ends with the words *ekādaśa kṣilim* (p. 48, note⁷⁷), where the *śa* is long by position before *kṣ* as it should be, but would not have been long in Pkt in which *kṣ* would have become *kh*; so that this line must have been composed in Skt and not in Pkt. Similarly another line ends *iti śrutah* (p. 32, note⁴³), where the second *i* is long by position in Skt but would not have been so in Pkt.

x. The Garuḍa has no Prakritisms except in some of the names, and these are too uncertain a basis on which to argue, for those Prakritisms might be original or might be due to the carelessness of copyists, yet one name certainly seems somewhat suggestive². All that is clear is that its account is the last and concisest redaction, that it was probably composed afresh in Skt, and that it makes frequent use of the termination *ka* for the sake of the metre. Its treatment of the name Adhisimakṛṣṇa suggests that it was composed from a bare list of kings, for it divides the name into two, *Adhisima* + *ka* (ending one line) and *Kṛṣṇa* (beginning the next line)³—which seems inexplicable unless it had only a prose list and chopped the names up into groups for each line.

¹ As in p. 18, note⁷; p. 30, note⁴⁶; and in these curt sentences *tasyāpi Aśoka-vardhanaḥ, tataś ca Ariṣṭakarmā*, and *tasmāt Yajñaśrīh*.

² *Dṛdhasenaka* appears as *Datḥasenaka* in

abGr, which may be a faulty Sanskritization of the Pkt *Dadhasena* + *ka*, though it might also be the form of that name in one kind of Pkt; see p. 16, note⁷².

³ See p. 4, note¹⁰.

APPENDIX II

The Oldest Scripts used in the Account.

Mistakes are found in the MSS, which can, it seems, be only explained satisfactorily by supposing that they arose out of misreadings of the ancient scripts (see Introdn. § 26). Some mistakes are obviously mere clerical blunders, but others cannot be accounted for naturally in that way. Kharoṣṭhī being the oldest Indian script that we know of, mistakes that could be traced to misreadings of its letters would be most significant. Such instances may singly be open to some distrust, but collectively they would have cumulative force; and without pronouncing a positive opinion, it does yet seem to me that certain misreadings do point to Kharoṣṭhī as their source. Such mistakes may prevail in many MSS, if they passed undetected from the beginning; otherwise they may only occur in single MSS, having been corrected in all the others.

i. First may be cited an instance from the Vś, because it affords the best illustration of a misreading that seems significant, though the Vś does not contain the oldest version. It calls *Aśoka* generally *Aśokavardhana*, but *kVś* has *Ayośokavardhana* (p. 28, note ²⁸). Here *yo* is obviously a misreading of *śo*; the copyist read the *śo* as *yo* and wrote *yo*, then he (or some one else) perceived the mistake and wrote or inserted *śo* in the copy, but the *yo* was not cancelled and the erroneous name *Ayośoka* remained and was repeated till it appears in *kVś*. Now *śo* could not be mistakenly read as *yo* in any Indian script except Kharoṣṭhī, and in that *śo* and *yo* were often written so much alike, that it is very difficult at times to say merely from the shape which letter was meant. Hence it seems reasonably certain that this passage in the Viṣṇu must have been originally taken from a Kharoṣṭhī MS. Had this mistake occurred in verse, the extra syllable would probably have been detected and the error corrected, but there was no such check in the prose of the Vś, and the mistake might have been followed in one copy (from which was descended *kVś*) though rectified in others.

Other misreadings of *ś* and *y* occur, namely—*Ayoḍa* for *Aśoka* in *lM*¹, where the second misreading of *k* as *d* might have arisen later in the Gupta script²; *Māgaḍhēso* in *jMt*³ where the more general readings are *Māgaḍhā ye*, *Māgaḍho yo* or *Māgaḍheya*; *Koyāla* in *cyVś*⁴ for *Kośala*, where *yā* might easily be read for *śa* because Kharoṣṭhī often did not distinguish between long and short vowels; and *Sāliyūka* in *eVā* for *Sāliśūka*⁵; *Mauryā dayo daśa* in *lVś*⁶, where *daśa* was probably first misread and written as *daya*, which was afterwards amended so as to read *Mauryādayo* incorrectly.

ii. Some similar variations seem to point to the same conclusion. The *Mt*

¹ P. 27, note ³.

² See Bühler's Ind. Palaeog., Table IV, cols. xxi, xxiii, and Table V, cols. viii, ix.

³ P. 14, note ¹.

⁴ P. 54, note ²¹. *Koyāla* is an error in writing, different from *Kośāla* which was

a variation of *Kauśalya* in pronunciation; see Actes du XIV^e Congrès International des Orientalistes, Alger, 1905, p. 217.

⁵ P. 29, note ³⁷.

⁶ P. 30, note ⁴⁶.

THE OLDEST SCRIPTS USED IN THE ACCOUNT 85

reading, *Kāśeyās*, appears in *djMt* as *Kāleyās*; and the mistake of *l* for *ś* seems best explainable by their similarity in Kharoṣṭhī. The *Vā* and *Bd* read *Kālukās*, which is probably a similar misreading of the equivalent name *Kāśakās*¹.

iii. Two other letters which might be confused in Kharoṣṭhī but not in any other script are *k* and *bh*, and there are some variations which seem to have so originated. The *Vā* generally, and the *Mt* sometimes, have *Twiga* instead of *Swiga*², a misreading the cause of which is not clear³, but the name *Swigabhrtiya* is generally corrupted to *Twigakrtiya* in the *Vā*, while *eVā* alone among the *Vā* MSS has preserved it nearly right as *Swigavrtiya*⁴. Here it seems certain that *bh* was misread as *k* in a Kharoṣṭhī MS. The converse appears to be the cause of the faulty *Mt* reading in p. 41, line 22, where *saumyo bhaviṣyati*, with no mention of the length of the reign, seems to be a misreading of the *Vā* and *Bd* reading *so 'py eka-vimśatiim*, for, while *saumyo* might be a later mistake and emendation for *sopye*, *bhaviṣyati* could be a misreading of *ka-vimśati* in Kharoṣṭhī only. The two forms would be *bhavissati* and *ka-risati* in Pali and probably also in literary Pkt, and these two would be almost identical in Kharoṣṭhī which generally wrote long and short vowels alike and doubled letters as single.

iv. As regards Brāhmī, I have not found any variations of importance which can be assigned definitely to misreadings of it, and there is not the same scope for detecting such errors, because there is more resemblance between Brāhmī and Gupta letters than between them and Kharoṣṭhī. All the mistakes that I have detected, which might be attributed to misreadings of Brāhmī letters, might equally well, or even better, be attributed to misreadings of Gupta letters. Hence it seems to me, speaking with diffidence, that no light is thrown by Brāhmī on the age of the account or the MSS, and that, so far as the negative argument is of weight, Brāhmī writing played no part in the early MSS of these dynastic accounts. If this be so, the accounts passed from Kharoṣṭhī into the Gupta script.

v. If these explanations of these variations be reasonable and not fanciful, it appears that the *Mt*, *Vā*, and *Vs* all betray the fact that their accounts were originally copied from MSS written in Kharoṣṭhī. This script was in use till A.D. 300, or perhaps even half a century later⁵. This conclusion would, as regards the *Mt* and *Vā*, agree with the period assigned to them⁶. There is no further indication regarding the date of the *Vs*, and as Kharoṣṭhī MSS would have lasted some centuries, the *Vs* account might well be later and yet have been extracted from such a MS. There has been no opportunity of testing the *Bd* account in this way, because I have not been able to collate any MS of it; and the printed edition betrays no misreadings of this kind; but it is so closely like the *Vā* that the same conclusion probably holds good for it.

vi. Nor have I found any variations in the Bhāgavata which point to misreadings of Kharoṣṭhī or even of Brāhmī. I have noticed only two peculiarities which may perhaps be significant.

In the list of Andhra kings *Hāla* was succeeded by a king whose name consisted of four syllables, the best supported forms of which are Mantalaka or

¹ P. 23, note ².

² P. 32, note ⁴⁷; p. 33, note ⁵².

³ Perhaps through the Pkt form *Swiga*; *s* carelessly made might be read as *t* in Kharoṣṭhī. The mistake is ancient as it is

found so widely.

⁴ P. 34, note ²⁵; *vrtiya* might be a modern misreading of *krtiya*.

⁵ JRAS, 1907, pp. 184-5.

⁶ See Introdn. §§ 21-24.

APPENDIX III

Pattalaka¹. The Bh calls them *Hāleya* and *Talaka* respectively, *Hāleya* ending the first half of a line and *Talaka* beginning the second half, thus:—

Aniṣṭakarmā Hāleyas Talakas tasya cātmañah.

These two names seem to be mistakes for *Hāla* and *Pattalaka*, the *pa* being misread as *ya*. If so, the wrong division of these two names in the middle of a line seems only explicable on the supposition that the Bh prepared this verse from a bare prose list of kings and divided the letters of the two names incorrectly. If this suggestion has any validity, it would appear that the Bh could not have been composed till after the time when *y* approximated to *p* in shape, that is, after the 7th century A.D.

The other instance is the name of the Andhra king *Āpilaka*, which appears in the Bh generally as *Civilaka*. The probable genesis of the changes in the name is suggested in p. 39, note⁴⁵, and the fact that seems significant here is that the compiler of the Bh account apparently drew his information from a *Vs* account in which he misread the initial *d* as *c*. This mistake could arise only in the Gupta script and not very well before the 7th century A.D.²

APPENDIX III

Janamejaya's Dispute with the Brahmins.

The dispute between the Paurava king Janamejaya³ and Vaiśampāyana and other brahmins is narrated in *AMt* 50, 57^b-65 and *AVā* 99, 250-256 and gives us an instance of how the text was revised⁴. The *(Mt)* version, which is the oldest, says the king made a successful stand against them for some time, but afterwards gave in and, making his son king, departed to the forest (according to custom); but the *Vā* version has abridged the inconvenient verses, and says he perished and the brahmins made his son king. This alteration may have been made (1) either in the *Bhavisya* when it was revised, and so passed into the *Vāyu*⁵, or (2) in the *Vāyu* itself; but it is impossible to decide this point, because *ēVā* and the *Bd*, which would have thrown much light on it, have unfortunately lost this passage in lacunae. What is clear is that a story of (royal opposition) to brahmanic claims was modified early in the 4th century A.D. to maintain brahmanic prestige.

As regards MSS, *bdhpMt* omit l. 6, read l. 9 instead of it and omit l. 9 from its place; *ceffjnMt* omit l. 9; *AMt* ll. 9, 20; *IMt* ll. 6-9; *mMt* reads l. 9 instead of l. 6, as well as in its proper place; *a¹dhVā* omit ll. 11-13; *LVā* ll. 11-13, 18-20; *AVā* ll. 14, 15; *LVā* ll. 16, 17; and *effmVā* want the whole.

¹ P. 41, l. 2.

² See Bühler's Ind. Pal., Table IV.

³ See p. 4, l. 2.

⁴ See Introdn. §§ 24, 30.

⁵ See Introdn. § 23.

JANAMEJAYA'S DISPUTE WITH THE BRAHMANS 87

Matsya.

Janamejayah Parikṣitah
 putrah parama-dhārmikah¹
 brāhmāṇaṁ² kalpayāmāsa
 sa vai³ Vājasaneyakam⁴
 sa⁶ Vaiśampāyanenaiva⁷
 śaptah⁹ kila¹⁰ maharṣinā
 na sthāsyatiba¹² durbuddhe¹³
 tavaitad vacanam bhuvi
 yāvat sthāsyasi tvaṁ loka¹⁴
 tāvad eva¹⁵ prapatsyati¹⁶
kṣatrasya vijayam jñātvā¹⁹
 tataḥ prabhṛti sarvaśaḥ
 abhigamya sthitāś²⁰ caiva²¹
 nṛpaṁ ca Janamejayam
 tataḥ prabhṛti śāpena
ksatriyasya tu yājinaḥ²⁵
 utsannā²⁶ yājinaḥ²⁷ yajñe²⁸
 tataḥ prabhṛti sarvaśaḥ
 kṣatrasya²⁹ yājinaḥ³⁰ kecic³¹
 chāpāt³² tasya mahātmanah

Vāyu.

Parikṣitas tu dāyādo
 rājāsij Janamejayah¹
 brāhmaṇān kalpayāmāsa
 sa vai vājasaneyikān⁶
 aśapat tam⁸ tadāmarṣād
Vaiśampāyana¹¹ eva tu
 na sthāsyatiha durbuddhe
 tavaitad vacanam bhuvi
 yāvat sthāsyāmy ahaṁ loka
 tāvan naitat¹⁷ prasasyate¹⁸ 5
 abhitaḥ²² samsthitaś²³ cāpi
 tataḥ sa²⁴ Janamejayah

10

¹ This is l. 2 on p. 4.² In *flMt* brāhmaṇaṁ, *jMt* brah°.³ In *cnMt* makhe; *jMt* makham; *eMt* makha.⁴ In *cfjMt* °yikam; *lMt* °yake.⁵ In *a°a°dhklVā* °yakān.⁶ In *hMt* tam.⁷ In *cejnMt* °yane caiva.⁸ So *a°a°a°bdghlVā*. *Ca°kVā* asapatnam.⁹ In *benMt* saptah; *hMt* saptam; *lMt* sapuh.¹⁰ In *eMt* kali.¹¹ So *Ca°lVā*: but *a°a°a°bdghlVā* °yanam.¹² In *bdMt* °iti.¹³ In *jMt* durbuddheh.¹⁴ So *CGVā°a°Mt*: *lMt* vai loka; *enMt* loka tvaṁ; *a°a°kMt* loka °smin; *cMt* lokaḥ. But *bdjghmpMt* sthāsyāmy ahaṁ loka, and *jMt* erply.¹⁵ In *hMt* etat.¹⁶ So *CGVā°a°Mt*; *npMt* °paśyati; *eMt* °yaśyati; *dMt* °śatsyati; *jkMt* °vatsyati; *a°a°cfghMt* °vatsyati; *nMt* °vaśyati; *lMt* °vatsyati.¹⁷ In *a°Vā* naiva.¹⁸ So *Ca°a°lVā*: but *a°a°gVā* prapatsyati; *bdhklVā* °paśyati.¹⁹ In *fjMt* jñātvam: *bdhmpMt* substitute l. 9 for this line; see note²⁵.²⁰ In *bdefjMt* sthitāś.²¹ *Caivam* in *cnMt*.²² In *bhVā* +pravi[ti]taḥ; *dVā* +pracittitaḥ.²³ In *dhVā* sa sthitāś.²⁴ In *hVā* +taka sa; *bVā* +takasaj; *dVā* +tak sa.²⁵ In *cnMt* yājinaḥ; *bdjghmpMt* vājinaḥ; *hMt* rājinaḥ.²⁶ So *ACMt*: *bdhpMt* omit this line, see note¹⁹, but *nMt* has it here also. In *bdMt* uchannā; *mMt* trasyanā above, *utsannā* here; *hMt* utkalasya.²⁷ In *bdmpMt* vājino; *hMt* rāj°.²⁸ In *dhmpMt* yajñe.²⁹ In *lMt* kṣatra[ya]sya.³⁰ In *lMt* yājinaḥ, *fjMt* rāj°: *bdjghmpMt* vājinaḥ, *hMt* rāj°.³¹ In *cnMt* kaścit.³² In *djMt* chāpām.

Matsya.

paurṇamāsenā ³³ haviṣā
 iṣṭvā tasmin ³⁴ prajāpatin.
 sa ³⁵ Vaiśampāyanenaiva
 praviśan ³⁷ vāritas ³⁸ tataḥ ³⁹
 Parikṣitaḥ suto 'sau vai ⁴²
 Pauravo Janamejayaḥ
 dvir aśvamedham āhṛtya ⁴²
 mahā-vājasaneyakam ⁴¹
 pravartayitvā tam sarvam ⁴⁵
 ṛṣir ⁴⁷ vājasaneyakam ⁴⁸

vivāde ⁵⁵ brāhmaṇaiḥ sūrdham
 abhiśapto vanam yayau
 Janamejayāc Chatānikas
 tasmā jajāne sa vīryavān ⁵³
 Janamejayaḥ ⁵⁹ Śātānikam
 putram rājye 'bhiṣiktavān ⁶¹.

- ³³ In dMt *pūrṇa*°.
³⁴ In fMt *dr̥ṣṭvā*°; eMt *iṣṭvā te 'smīn*;
 dMt *i tasmin*; nMt *iti 'smīn*.
³⁵ In a'a'ceknMt *tam*; jMt *te*; hMt *tad*;
 lMt *tad[e]*.
³⁷ In gVā *°taḥ paśye* (for *paśyet*?).
³⁸ In fMt *°viśat*; eMt *°viśen*; dMt *°viśan*.
³⁹ In hMt *nāvilas*.
⁴² In mpMt *tutaḥ*.
⁴⁰ Sic: read *tadvad dhiṣṭam*?
⁴¹ In a'a'gVā *mukhe*.
⁴² In CbdfpMt *so vai, cenMt yo*°: hMt
tataḥ śāpāt.
⁴³ In jMt *ākṛtya*; pMt *āruhya*.
⁴⁴ So CbdfjklmpMt; AefgknMt *°yakah*, eMt
°yikah.
⁴⁵ In gVā *°yikam*.
⁴⁶ In chjMt *tat*°; fgMt *tān sarvān*.
⁴⁷ So bcdefgklmpMt: ACmMt *ṛṣim*; jMt
ṛṣer: hMt reads this half line *svavarcā* (for
kharvā ca?) *Janamejayaḥ*.

Vāyu.

paurṇamāsyena haviṣā
 devam iṣṭvā prajāpatim
 vijñāya samsthito 'paśyat ³⁶
 tadvadhiṣṭām ⁴⁰ vibhor makhe ⁴¹
 Parikṣit-tanayaś cāpi
 Pauravo Janamejayaḥ
 dvir aśvamedham āhṛtya
 tato vājasaneyakam ⁴⁵
 pravartayitvā tad brahma
 trikharvī ⁴⁹ Janamejayaḥ 15
 kharvam ⁵⁰ Aśvaka⁵¹-mukhyānām
 kharvam ⁵² Aṅga-nivāsinām
 kharvam ⁵³ ca Madhyadesānām
 trikharvī ⁵⁴ Janamejayaḥ
 viśādād ⁵⁶ brāhmaṇaiḥ sūrdham
 abhiśastaḥ ⁵⁷ kṣayam yayau
 tasya putraḥ Śātāniko
 balavān satya-vikramaḥ
 tataḥ sutam ⁶⁰ Śātānikam
 viprās tam abhyaṣecayan ⁶². 20

- ⁴³ In eMt *°yikam*; efyjklMt *°yakah*.
⁴⁹ So Ca'a'bgVā; a'Vā *°kharvī*: with dia-
 lectic variation of *kh* and *g*, glVā *°sarvī*,
 a'Vā *°sairvī*; dVā *°svarcā*; hVā *°svacī*.
⁵⁰ In ghVā *sarvam*.
⁵¹ In gVā and one MS of CVā *Aśmaka*.
⁵² In gVā *sarvam*.
⁵³ In ghVā *sarvam*.
⁵⁴ In dVā *°kharvā*; hVā *°kharvī*; gVā
°sarvī; kVā *°sadyī*.
⁵⁵ In bdpMt *°dam*; jMt *°do*.
⁵⁶ In a'kVā *viśādo*.
⁵⁷ In hVā *°sataḥ*.
⁵⁸ In jMt *su-v*°; after this line jMt inserts
 Mt l. 6 on p. 4.
⁵⁹ In nMt *°jayā*; hMt *tatas te tu*.
⁶⁰ In dVā *tam tu*.
⁶¹ In hMt *viprā rāj*°, altered to *putram*
tasyābhyāṣecayat.
⁶² In dghVā *tasyābhy*°. CVā *tam abhya-*
ṣecayat.

b = brahman.
c = country.
d = dynasty.
f = family.
k = king or prince.
mt = mountain.

p = people.
pat = patronymic.
q = queen.
r = river.
t = town.

Akarka ? 19.
 Agnimitra 31, 70, 82.
 Aṅga *p.* 32, 34, 49, 73.
 Acala 16, 68.
 Aja-ka 19, 68.
 Ajaya 22, 69.
 Ajātaśatru 21, 69.
 Aṭamāna 40.
 Adhisāmakṛṣṇa 4.
 Adhisīmakṛṣṇa 1, 4, 5, 8, 10,
 15, 65, 83 ; vii, ix, x.
 Adhisomakṛṣṇa 4.
 Aniruddha 5.
 Anīṣṭakarman 41, 86.
 Anurakṣaka 10.
 Anuvrata 16, 67.
 Antaka 31, 70.
 Antarīkṣa 10, 66, 82.
 Andhaka 31.
 Andhra *d.* 2, 35, 38-43, 45,
 50, 51, 54, 58, 59, 61,
 71-75, 79, 81, 85, 86 ;
 xii, xiii, xv, xviii, xix.
 xxvi, xxvii.
 Andhraka 31, 70.
 Andhrabhṛtya *d.* 44-46, 72.

Apīṭaka 39.
 Apīlaka 39.
 Apolavan 39.
 Apratāpin, ⁹tīpin 14, 67.
 Abala 16.
 abda xxiii.
 Abhimanyu 1, 4, 65; viii, ix.
 Amantrajit 11.
 Amitrajit 10, 67.
 Ayutāyus 14, 67.
 Ayodhyā *t.* 10; v, ix, xii.
 Arikta-karṇa, -varṇa 41.
 Ariñjaya 17, 68.
 Ariṣṭakarṇa 36, 40, 41, 71.
 Ariṣṭa-karṇi, -karman 41.
 Arjuna 8, 66.
 Arbuda *mt.* 54, 74.
 Avanti *c, p.* 18, 54, 68.
 †Aśoka *d.* 24.
 Aśoka-vardhana 27, 28, 70.
 84; xiv, xxii.
 Aśmaka *d.* 24, 69.-
 Aśvamedha-ja, -datta 4, 65.
 Aṣaṇḍa *p.* 47
 aṣṭa xxiii.
 Aśmākṛṣṇa 5, 65; ix.

Ahinara 7, 66.
 Ahninarā 7.
 Ājaya 22.
 Āti 40.
 Āndhra *d.* 2, 35, 45, 54, 58,
 59, 72.
 Āndhrabhr̥tya *d.* 45.
 Āpādaba- 39
 Āpītaka 39.
 Āpilaka 36, 39, 71, 86.
 Āpilavan, Āpol° 39.
 Ābhūra *c, p.* 3, 44-47, 54,
 65, 72, 74, 81.
 Ādraka 31, 70.
 Ārpavan, Āryāl° 39.
 Ārya *p.* 56, 74.
 Āvantya *p.* 54, 74.
 †Āvabhr̥tya *d.* 45.
 Ikṣvāku, °ka *d.* 2, 9-12, 23,
 65-67.
 Ikhāku *d.* 37.
 Indrapālita 29, 70.
 Ilā *q* ? 2.
 Ivīlaka 39.

- Iṣuṇjaya 17, 68.
 Ukta 5.
 Ugrasena 4.
 Utkala c. 2.
 Uttarā q. 4, 65.
 Udathana ? 7.
 Udāmbhī ? 22.
 Udayana (1) 7, 66, 82; xxii:
 (2) 22.
 Udayāśva 22, 69.
 Udāyin 20, 22, 69.
 Udāna ? 7, 66.
 Udāsin ? 22, 69.
 Urukriya 9.
 Urukṣaya 9, 66.
 Urva 7, 66.
 Uṣṇa 5, 66.
 Ūrva ? 7.
 Rca 6, 66.
 †Ekaliṅga d. 24.
 Eḍa = Aḍa, 2.
 Ela = Aila, 2.
 expletives 77-82; xxiv.
 Aikṣvākava d. 2.
 Aikṣvāku, °ka d. 5, 8, 12
 23, 66, 67, 69: v-x, xx
 xxvii.
 Aḍa pat. 2.
 Aila pat. 1, 2, 12, 65, 67.
 Odra c, p. 54, 73.
 Kāika d. 45.
 Kaccha c. 54.
 Kaḍhu ? p. 52.
 †Kaṇṭha = Kaṇva, 33.
 †Kaṇṭhāyana = Kāṇvāyana
 34.
 Kaṇva d. 32-35, 38, 70-71.
 Kāṇvāyana d. 34, 35, 38.
 Kanaka 74.
 Kanakāhvaya 54, 74.
 Kanha 37.
 Kardabhila = Gard°, 45.
 Karmaka ? d. 50.
 Karmajit 15, 67.
 Kali age 55-62, 74-76, 79;
 v, viii-x, xiv-xvii, xxvii.
 Kali-ka 25, 69.
 Kalikilā ? t. 48.
 Kaliṅga c, p. 54, 74.
 Kaliṅga-ka d. 24, 69.
 Kalinda ? d. 24.
 Kalki 78.
 Kaviratha 6, 66.
 Kākakarna 21.
 Kākavarṇa 21, 68.
 Kāika = Kaika.
 Kāñcanakā t. 59, 73.
 Kāñcī t. 55.
 Kāṇva d. 32-35, 38, 70-71.
 Kāṇvāyana d. 20, 22, 23,
 33-35, 38, 50, 69, 71;
 xv, xix, xxvi.
 Kāntāpurī t. 53.
 Kāntī-purī t. 53.
 Kālaka ? d. 23, 85.
 Kālatoyaka, °top°, p. 54, 73.
 Kāliṅga d. 24.
 Kāleya ? d. 23, 85.
 Kāśaka d. 85.
 Kāśaya d. 23.
 Kāśi t. 69.
 Kāśeya d. 23, 85.
 Kāśmīra c. 55, 74.
 Kinnara 10, 66.
 Kinnarāśva 10, 66.
 Kilākila d. 48, 72; xii.
 Kilikilā t. 48.
 Kīrtivardhana 19.
 Kuḍava ? 12, 67.
 Kuṇḍaka 11, 67.
 Kunāla 28, 29, 70.
 Kuntala 36, 40, 71.
 Kuru d. 23, 24, 69.
 Kulaka 8, 11, 67.
 Kulāla ? 28, 29.
 Kulika 11.
 Kuviratha 6, 66.
 Kuśala (1) 25: (2) 40.
 Kuśala ? 28.
 Kusumapura t. 69.
 Kusumāhvaya t. 22.
 Kūrmajit ? 15.
 Kṛta age 57, 63, 74, 76.
 Kṛtajit ? 11.
 Kṛtāñjaya, °tiñ°, 11, 67.
 Kṛpa b. 4.
 Kṛṣṇa 36, 37, 39, 71.
 Kṛṣṇa (Viṣṇu) 61, 62, 75,
 76, 79; vii, x.
 Kelikila d. 48.
 Kaikila d. 48.
 Kailikila d. 48.
 kaivarta caste, 3, 52, 65, 73.
 Kojāla c. 84.
 Koṭilya = Kaṇṭilya, b. 26-28.
 Komalā ? t. 51.
 Kolikila d. 48.
 Kośala (North), see Kosala.
 Kośalā t. 51, 73.
 Kosala (North) c, p. 3, 9, 53,
 54, 65, 73, 84.
 Kosala (South) p. 65.
 Kaucei ? t. 55.
 Kaṇṭilya b. 26-28, 69, 70.
 Kaṇḍilya b. 28.
 Kaunti t. 55, 74.
 Kaurava d. 4; v, viii, xxvii.
 Kauśala d. 51.
 Kauśalya adj. 84.
 Kauśāmbī t. 5, 65; v, xv.
 †Kruddhodana 11, 67.
 kṣatra 2, 8, 25, 52, 53, 68,
 69, 73, 87.
 kṣatriya xvii.
 Kṣatroja ? 21.
 Kṣatraujas 21, 68.
 Kṣama 15.
 Kṣaya 9.
 Kṣudraka (1) 8: (2) 11, 67.
 Kṣulika 11, 67.
 Kṣettula ? 40.
 Kṣetrajās 21.
 Kṣetrajña 21, 68.
 Kṣetradharman 21.
 Kṣepaka ? 7.

INDEX

91

- Kṣema-ka 13, 15, 16, 67.
 Kṣemaka 7, 8, 66, 77; vii.
 Kṣemajit 21, 68. •
 Kṣemadhanvan ? 21.
 Kṣemadharman, 20, 21, 68.
 Kṣemabhūmi 32, 70.
 Kṣemavarman 21.
 Kṣemavid ? 21.
 Kṣemārcis ? 21.
 Kṣemya 15.

 Khaṇḍapāṇi 7, 66.
 Kharoṣṭhī *script* 84, 85; xvi,
 xxiii, xxvii.
 Khemaka 77.

 Ganges 5, 22, 53, 54, 65,
 69, 73.
 Gabhīra 51, 73.
 Gayā *t.* 2.
 Garuṇḍa ? *d.* 46, 47.
 Gardabhin *d.* 45, 46, 72, 81.
 Gardabhila *d.* 44-46, 72.
 Girivraja *t.* 14, 21, 67, 68.
 Gupta *d.* 53, 54, 73; xii,
 xiii, xxiv, xxv.
 Gupta *era* xii-xvi.
 Gurukṣepa 9.
 Guruṇḍa *d.* 44, 46, 47, 72.
 Guruṇḍikā bhāṣā 46.
 Guha 54, 74.
 Guhya ? *d.* 53.
 Gotamiputra 37, 42.
 Gomati 42.
 Gomatiputra 42.
 Gautama (Buddha) vii.
 Gautamiputra 36, 42, 71.
 Gaunarda *d.* 3, 65.
 Gaurakṣṇa ? 41.
 Great Bear 59-62, 75.

 Ghoṣa-vasu 32, 70.

 Cakārā ? 41.
 Cakora 36, 41, 71.
 Cājaka ? 19.
 Cāḍasrī ? 43.

 Cāḍasīta 37.
 Cāḍasrī 43, 72.
 Catarapana 37.
 Candragupta (Maurya) 27,
 28, 70; vii.
 Candragupta I (Gupta) xii.
 Candrabhāgā *r.* 55, 74.
 Candravīja, °vijña, °vīrya ?
 43.
 Candraśrī, °śīja, 36, 43.
 Candrāmśa, °śu, 49, 72.
 Candrābha 49.
 Campā-vatī *t.* 53, 54, 73, 74.
 Calaka, °lika ? *p.* 2, 50.
 Citraratha 5, 6, 66.
 Citrākṣa 6.
 Cilibaka ? 39.
 Civilaka ? 39, 86.
 Cūlika *p.* 2, 65.
 Caitraratha 6.
 Caidyoparicara 13.

 †Chismaka 38.
 †Chośala = Kośala, 54.

 Janaka 19, 68.
 Janamejaya 1, 4, 65, 86-
 88; ix, xiv, xix.
 Janmejaya 4.
 Jarāsandha 14, 67.
 †Javana 45.
 Jāhnavī *r.* 53.

 Talaka 41, 71, 86.
 Tāmralipta, Tāma°, *c.* *p.* 54,
 74.
 Tigma 7, 66.
 Tigmātman 7, 66.
 Timi 7.
 Tilaka ? 19.
 Tiṣya *constell.* 57, 74.
 tu 78, 80, 81; xxvi.
 Tukhāra *d.* 45-47, 72; xix.
 †Tuṅga *d.* 32, 33, 85.
 †Tuṅgakṛtya *d.* 34, 85.
 Turuṣkaka, °kara, *d.* 46.

 Tuṣāra *d.* 44-47, 72; xix,
 xxvi.
 Tuṣkara *d.* 45, 72.
 Tūlika ? *p.* 2.
 †Tehaya *d.* 24.
 Trikharvin 88.
 Tricakṣa 6, 66.
 Trinetra 16, 68.
 Trivakṣya 6.
 Trairāja, °jya, *c.* 54.
 Tvaṣṭr ? 5.

 Daṭhasenaka 16.
 Dandapāṇi 7, 66.
 Daṇḍasrī 43, 72.
 Dadhicikṣṇa ? 5.
 Damitra 51.
 Darbhaka 21, 69.
 Darśaka 21, 69.
 Davikorvī *c.* 55.
 daśa xxiv.
 Daśaratha 27-29, 70, 82.
 Daśona ? 29, 70.
 Dāpilaka 39.
 Dāmadhandra ? 49.
 Dārvikeyi *c.* 55.
 Dārvikorvī, Dāvi°, *c.* 55, 74.
 Daśaratha 29.
 Divāka 9.
 Divākara 5, 9, 10, 15, 66; ix.
 Divānīka 39.
 Divārka 9, 66.
 Divīlaka 36, 39.
 Durdamana 7, 66.
 Durbala ? 7.
 Durmitra 51, 73.
 Dūrva, °vi 7, 66.
 Dr̥ḍhanetr 16.
 Dr̥ḍhasena 13, 16, 68.
 Devakorvī *c.* 55.
 Devadharman 29, 70.
 Devabhūti 32, 33.
 Devabhūmi 32, 34, 70, 71.
 Devarakṣita *d.* 54, 73.
 Devavarman 29, 70.
 Daivarakṣita *d.* 54.
 Dyumatsena 16, 68.

- Draupadi *q.* 4.
 Dviyajña ? 43.

 Dhanadharman 49, 72.
 Dhanastraya ? 11, 67.
 Dharma (1) 11: (2) 16, 68: (3) 49, 72.
 Dharmakṣetra 16.
 Dharmanetra 13, 16, 68.
 Dharmavarman 49.
 Dharmasūtra 16, 68.
 Dharmīn 11, 67, 82.
 Dhārmika 11.
 Dhūlika ? *p.* 2.
 Dhṛtimant 6, 66.
 Dhṛaka, Dhruka ? 31.
 Dhruvāśva 10, 66.

 Nakula 4.
 Nakhapāna 49, 72.
 Nakhavant 48, 72.
 Nanda 23, 25, 58, 62, 69, 74, 75; xix.
 Nanda *d.* 23-26, 50.
 Nandasāra 28.
 Nandiyāśas 49.
 Nandivardhana (1) 19, 68: (2) 22, 69.
 Nabhāra 51.
 Nabhīra 50, 73.
 Naramitra 7, 66.
 Nala 51, 73.
 Nahapāna 49; xxiv-xxvi.
 †Nahula 11.
 Nāka *d.* 53, 73.
 Nāga *d.* 49, 53, 72, 73; xii.
 Nāgasāhvaya *t.* 5.
 Nāga-siri 37.
 Nārāyaṇa 34, 71.
 Nārīkṣṇa ? 41.
 †Nāhula 11.
 Nicakra 5.
 Nicakṣu 5, 6, 65; v.
 Nimi 7, 66.
 Nimittaka ? 7.
 Nirāmitra (1) 7, 66, 77: (2) 14, 67.

 Nirmātman 7.
 Nirvaktra ? 5, 65.
 Nirvṛti 13, 16, 68.
 Niścakru 5.
 Niśadha *c.* *p.* 51, 54, 73.
 Nita ? 17, 68.
 Nipa *d.* 3, 65.
 numerals xxiii-xxvi.
 Nurakṣaya ? 9.
 Nṛcaka ? 5.
 Nṛcakra 6.
 Nṛcakṣus 6, 66.
 Nṛpañjaya 7, 66.
 nṛpati *k?* 16.
 Nṛpaskanda 42.
 Nṛbandhu 6.
 Nṛbhṛta ? 16.
 Nṛvadha ? 5.
 Netra 16, 68.
 Nemikṛṣṇa 41.
 Nemicakra 5, 65.
 Naimiṣa forest viii, x.
 Naimiṣika *p.* 54, 73.
 Naiśadha *p.* 51, 53, 54, 73.
 Naiśāda *p.* 54.
 Naurikṛṣṇa ? 41.

 Pakṣa ? 15.
 Pañcaka *p.* 52, 73.
 Pañcāla *c.* *d.* 3, 23, 65, 69.
 Paṭu ? *p.* 52.
 †Paṭumant 40.
 Paṭumitra ? *d.* 51, 73.
 Paṭṭa ? *p.* 52.
 Paṭṭamitra ? *d.* 51.
 †Paḍhumant 40.
 Paḍhumitra ? *d.* 51.
 Pattalaka 36, 41, 71, 86.
 Pattallaka 41.
 †Paḍumant 36.
 Padumāvi 40.
 Padumindra ? *d.* 51.
 Padmamitra ? *d.* 51, 73.
 Padmāvatī *t.* 52, 73.
 Paraśu-Rāma *b.* 25, 69.
 Parāśara *b.* viii.
 Parīkṣit 1-4, 58, 59, 61, 62, 65, 74, 75, 87, 88; viii-x.
 Paritmava ? 6.
 Pariplava, °pluta 6, 66.
 Pariṣṇava 6, 66.
 Palika 18.
 Pāñcāla *d.* 23.
 Pāṇḍava *f.* 1, 12, 62, 75; v, viii, xxvii.
 Pāṇḍu 8, 66.
 pāraśava *caste*, 2, 65.
 Pariplava ? 6.
 Pārtha 8.
 Pālaka 18, 19, 68.
 Pālī *lang.* 14, 78; xi, xxvii.
 Pucchaka ? 38.
 Puṇḍra-ka *p.* 54.
 Puttalaka ? 41.
 Putramitra ? 31.
 Putraya ? 7.
 Putrikāṣeṇa ? 41.
 Pundramindra ? *d.* 51.
 Purañjaya (1) 7: (2) 18: (3) 49, 72.
 Purāṇas xvii, xxvii.
 Furāṇa ? *d.* 46, 47.
 purāṭāna 8.
 purāvid 8.
 Purikā *t.* 49, 73.
 Purīkaṣeṇa 41, 71.
 Purisadata 37.
 Purindrasena 36, 41.
 †Puriṣabhīru, °bheru, °bhoru 41.
 †Puriṣasenu 41.
 Puruṇḍa ? *d.* 46, 47.
 *Puruṣasena 41.
 Pulaka, °lika 18, 68.
 Pulaka ? *p.* 50.
 Pulinda *p.* 2, 52, 65, 73.
 Pulinda-ka 32, 70.
 Pulindasena 41.
 †Pulimant 42.
 Puliha ? *p.* 2.
 Pulumāyi 37.
 Pulumāvi 37.
 Puloman (°māvi?) (1) 36

INDEX

93

- 42, 71, 81: (2) 36, 43, 71.
 Pulomāci, °arci 43.
 Pulomāri ? 43.
 Pulomāvi (1) 36, 40, 71: (2) 36, 43, 58, 72, 74.
 Puškara 10, 66.
 +Puškala 11, 67.
 Puṣpamitra ? 31.
 Puṣpamitra ? d. 51, 73.
 Puṣya *constell.* 59, 75.
 Puṣyamitra 31, 70.
 Puṣyamitra d. 50, 51, 73.
 Pūru 8, 66.
 Pūrṇotsaṅga 36, 39, 71.
 Pūrṇosantu ? 39.
 Pūrvā Āśādhā *const.* 62, 75.
 Paundra-ka p. 3, 54, 65, 74
 Paura ? 47.
 Paurava d. 1-8, 23, 65, 66, 77, 86, 88; v-x, xxvii.
 paurāṇika 8.
 Paurṇamāsa 39.
 Pauloma 58.
 Pranītāśva 10.
 Prativyūha 9, 66.
 Prativyoma 9, 66.
 Pratikāśva, °kāśa 10, 66.
 Pratitāśva, °taka 10, 66.
 Pratipa 59, 75.
 Pratipāśva 10, 66.
 Prativya 10, 66.
 Pradyota 18, 68; vii.
 Pradyota d. 17-19, 23, 68.
 Pradyotana d. 19.
 Prabhu 15.
 Prayāga t. 53, 54, 73; xii.
 Pravarasena 48.
 Pravira-ka 48, 50, 73.
 Pravillasena 41.
 Prasenajit 11, 67.
 Prādyota d. 19.
 baṭaka 42.
 Bandhupālita 29, 70.
 bard xi, xxvii.
 Barhis 11.
 bahavo ? 42.
 Bahukarmaka ? 15, 67.
 Bārhadbala d. 12.
 Bārhadratha d. 5, 13-18, 23, 67, 68, 78; v-x, xxvii.
 Bālaka 18, 19, 68.
 Bālhika d. 2, 50.
 Bāhula 11, 67.
 Bāhlīka d. 50, 73.
 Buddha vii.
 Buddhasimha vii.
 Brhatkarman 15, 67.
 Brhatksaya 9, 66.
 Brhatsena 15, 67.
 Brhadaśva 10, 66.
 Brhadbala 9, 12, 66, 67.
 Brhadbhraja 11, 67.
 Brhadraja 9.
 Brhadratha (1) 13: (2) 7, 66: (3) 9: (4) 17 note 4: (5) 28, 29, 31, 70.
 Brhadratha d. 13-18.
 Brhadrāja, °vāja 11, 67.
 Brhaspati *planet* 57, 74.
 Benares 21, 68.
 Brāhmī *script* 85; xvi.
 Bhakṣyaka p. 54.
 Bhagavata 30, 32.
 Bhagendra 40.
 Bhadra-ka 31, 70.
 Bhadrāsāra 28.
 +Bharadvāja 11.
 Bharaut t. 48.
 Bhaviṣya *Purāṇa* 2, 12, 13, 59, 65, 75; *Introdu.*
 Bhāgavata *king* (1) 30, 70: (2) 30, 32.
 +Bhāturaltha 10.
 Bhānu 9, 66.
 Bhānumant 10, 66.
 Bhānuratha 10, 66.
 Bhārata *battle* 14, 67.
 Bhārgava b. 25.
 Bhīmasena 4.
 Bhuvata ? 16, 67.
 Bhūtenanda-na 49.
 Bhūtinanda 49, 73.
 Bhūtimitra 34.
 Bhūmitra 34.
 Bhūminanda 49.
 Bhūmiputra 34.
 Bhūmimitra 34, 71.
 Bhūri (1) 5, 66: (2) 15.
 Bhokṣyaka p. 54, 74.
 Bhogavardhana t. 49.
 Bhogin 49, 72.
 Bhojaka p. 54, 74.
 Magadha c. p. 23, 53, 54, 67, 73; v, ix-xii, xvi, xxvii.
 Maghā *constell.* 59, 61, 62, 75.
 Maṇidhāna-ka d. 54, 73.
 Maṇidhānya d. 54, 73; xii.
 Maṇidhāra-ka d. 54, 73.
 Maṇḍalaka 41.
 Mathurā t. 53, 73; xvi.
 Madra 31.
 Madra-ka p. 52, 73.
 Madhunandana 32.
 Madhunandi 49, 73.
 Madhyadeśa 10; xvi.
 Mananṭa ? d. 46.
 Maniṣin 15.
 Manu 2, 51, 67, 73, 77.
 Manudeva 10.
 Mantalaka 36, 41, 71, 85.
 Mandulaka 41.
 Maruṇḍa d. 46, 47.
 Marudeva 10, 66.
 Marunandana 32.
 Marubhūmi c. 54, 74.
 Mallakarni 39.
 Mahatsena 16.
 Mahākossala c. 65.
 Mahādeva 58, 74.
 Mahānanda 58, 74; vii.
 Mahānandi-n 22, 25, 69.
 Mahāpadma 23-26, 58, 69, 74, 75.
 Mahābhārata 4.
 Mahārāṣṭri bhāṣā 46.
 Mahāsena 16.

- Mahiṣa, °sya *p.* 51, 54, 74.
 Mahiṣati *t.* 50.
 Mahiṣi *p.* 51, 73.
 Mahiṣika *p.* 54.
 Mahinara 7, 66.
 Mahineta 16, 68.
 Mahendra 40.
 Mahendra *mt.* 54, 74.
 Māgadha *p.* 14, 52, 54, 73,
 84; x, xi.
 Māgadha *t.* 52.
 Māgadhi *Prakrit* xi, xxvii.
 Māgadheya 14.
 Mādhariputa 37.
 Mānava *d.* 12.
 Mānjari 14, 67.
 Mālakarṇi 39.
 Māladhānya *d.* 54.
 Mālava *p.* 54, 74.
 Mālīka ? 18.
 Māhiṣati *t.* 50.
 Māhiṣi *p.* 51.
 Māhiṣmatī *t.* 50.
 Māhendiabhauma *c.* 54.
 Māheya *p.* 54.
 Mikalā ? *t.* 51.
 Mitra 14.
 minstrel xi, xxvii.
 Mukhābāṇa 6.
 Muṇḍa *d.* 46, 72.
 Munaya 7.
 Munika 18, 68.
 Muruṇḍa *d.* 44-47, 72, 81.
 Mulindaka 32.
 Muṣita *p.* 54.
 Mūrjaka, Mj° ? 19.
 Mūlika ? *p.* 2.
 Mūsika, Mṛs° *p.* 54, 74.
 Nṛgendra 36, 40, 71.
 Nṛdu 7, 66.
 Mekala *p.* 3, 65.
 Mekala *d.* 51.
 Mekalā *t.* 51, 73.
 Megha *d.* 51, 73.
 Meghasvāti (1) 36, 40, 71;
 (2) 36, 40.
 Meghasvāmin 40.
 Medaśiras 42.
 Medya ? *d.* 51.
 Medhasvāti 40.
 Medhāvin 6, 7, 66.
 Medhunandi 49.
 Mevabhūmi *c.* 54.
 Maitreya *b.* viii.
 Maithila *d.* 24, 69, 79.
 Mona ? *d.* 46.
 Momegha ? 32.
 Moon 57, 74.
 Mauna *d.* 45-48, 72, 81;
 xxv.
 Maurya *d.* 26-30, 50, 69, 70,
 84; xix.
 Maula ? *d.* 46.
 Mleccha *racēs* 3, 46, 47, 55,
 56, 65, 72, 74, 80; xxi,
 xxvi.
 Yakṣa ? 16.
 Yajuhśri ? 42.
 Yajñamitra 32.
 Yajñāśri 36, 37, 42, 71; xiii,
 xxvii.
 Yaṇa 37.
 Yadu-ka *p.* 52, 73.
 †Yadumāvi 40.
 Yavana *d.* 2, 3, 44-46, 48,
 65, 72, 82; xii, xxii.
 Yavana *race* 2, 3, 56, 74.
 Yaśomāndi 49, 73.
 Yājñavalkya *b.* 4.
 Yāvana ? *d.* 45.
 Yāvanī bhāṣā 46.
 Yudaka ? *p.* 54.
 Yudhiṣṭhira 61, 75; ix, x
 Yāna *d.* 82.
 Yomegha ? 32, 70.
 Yauna *d.* 46, 53.
 Raṇaka 12, 67.
 Raṇaṇjaya 8, 11, 67.
 Raṇejaya 11.
 Rathājaya 11.
 Rājaka 19, 68.
 Rājāda ? 41.
 †Rātula 11, 67.
 Rāndha ? *d.* 53.
 Rāma *b.* 25, 49.
 Rāmacandra 49, 72.
 Rāhula 11, 67.
 Ripu ? 15.
 Ripukā ? *t.* 49.
 Ripuṇjaya (1) 15; (2) 17,
 18, 68.
 †Rītihotra *d.* 18, 24.
 Ruca 6, 66.
 †Rurukṣaya 9.
 Lambodara 36, 39, 71.
 †Lāṅgala 11, 67.
 Vaṇśaka 22, 69.
 Vakhaṃpita 49.
 Vagara 49.
 Vaṅgara, °gava 49, 73.
 Vaṅgiri 49, 73.
 Vajramitra (1) 31; (2) 32, 70.
 vaṭaka 42.
 Vaṇḍāśri ? 43.
 Vatsa ? 9, 66.
 Vatsadroha 9, 66.
 Vatsavyūha, °vṛddha 9, 66.
 Vandāṃśa ? 49.
 vandin xi.
 Varāṅga 49, 73.
 Varukarṇa ? 18.
 Vartivardhana ? 19, 68.
 Vasu 13.
 Vasujyestha 31, 70.
 Vasudāna, °dāman 7, 66.
 Vasudeva 33, 70.
 Vasudeva (Kṛṣṇa's father) 61,
 75.
 Vasudhāman ? 7.
 Vasuputra 31.
 Vasumitra 31, 70.
 Vasuśreṣṭha 31.
 Vahinara 7, 66.
 Vākāṭaka *c.* 45.
 Vājasaneya-ka *doctrine* 1, 87,
 88.
 Vāmacandra 49.

INDEX

95

- Vāyumitra 31.
 Vārāṇasī *t.* 21.
 †Vārisāra 28.
 Vārhadraṭha *d.* 13-17.
 Vāhikas *d.* 50.
 Vāsīthīputa 37.
 Vāsudeva 33.
 Vāhika *p.* 50.
 Vāhika ? *p.* 50.
 Vāhika *d.* 50.
 vi xxiv.
 Vīmśaja 49, 73.
 Vikala ? 39.
 Vikramitra 32.
 Vicakṣus 5.
 Vijaya 36, 43, 72.
 Viḍūraṭha 12.
 Viḍiśa *t.* 48, 72; x.
 Viḍūra *c.* *mt.* 51.
 †Vidmisāra 21.
 †Vidhisāra 21, 70.
 Vinatāśva *c.* 2.
 Vinaya 43.
 Vindusāra 28; xxiii.
 †Vindusena 21.
 Vindhyaka *d.* 50, 73.
 Vindhyaśakti 45, 48-50, 72, 73.
 Vindhyaśena 21.
 Vipra 15, 67.
 Vibhu 15, 67.
 Vimbisāra 21, 68.
 Vimvasphāṭi 52.
 Virāṭa 65.
 Vivakṣa ? 6.
 Vivakṣu 5, 65.
 †Vivisāra 21.
 Viśākhabhūpa, °rūpa 19.
 Viśākhayūpa 18, 19, 68.
 Viśāṣayūpa, °sūya 19.
 Viśvajit 17, 68.
 Viśvanātha *god* 25.
 Viśvasphāṇi 23, 24, 27, 30, 33, 35, 52, 73; xix.
 Viśvasphāṭika, °sphāci, °sphāti, °sphāni, °sphāti, °sphūrji, °sphūrṭi 52.
 Viṣṇumant 6.
 Vitahotra *d.* 3, 18, 24.
 Vitihotra *d.* 3, 18, 24, 65, 68, 69.
 Virajit 17, 68.
 Virasena 4.
 Vūlika ? *p.* 2.
 Vrttimant 6.
 Vṛṣṭimant 6, 66.
 Vṛṣṇimant 5, 66.
 Vṛhatkarman 15.
 Vṛhatkṣaṇa ? 9.
 Vṛhatsena 16.
 Vṛhadaśva 29, 70.
 Vṛhadbala 9.
 Vṛhadraṭha, *see* Brhad°.
 Vṛhañjaya 11.
 Vēdiśa 48.
 Vaidiśa-ka *p.* 3, 49, 65, 73.
 Vaidūra, °rya *mt.* 51, 73.
 Vairāṭi *pat.* 4.
 Vaiśampāyana *b.* 1, 86-88.
 Vyāsa *b.* 2, 65; viii, xvii, xviii, xxvii.
 Vrajabhāṣā 46.
 Vratā ? 11, 67.
 vrātya *castes* 54, 55, 74.
 Śaka *d.* 2, 3, (24, note ¹⁰), 44-46, 52, 65, 72, 81; xxiv-xxvi.
 Śaka *era* xxiv, xxv.
 Śakavarṇa 21, 68.
 Śakya *d.* 45.
 Śakya 8, 11.
 Śakyāmāna 51, 73.
 †Śaṅka 32, 80.
 Śaṅkamāna 51, 73.
 Śaṅkukarṇa 4.
 Śata xxiv.
 Śatamdhānuṣ 29, 70.
 Śatamyajña 15.
 Śatajit 11.
 Śatañjaya 15.
 Śatadhanuṣ 29, 70.
 Śatadhanvan 28, 29, 70.
 Śatadhara 29.
 Śatānika (1) 4, 65, 88. (2) 4: (3) 4, 7, 63.
 Śatrujayin ? 16.
 Śanaka 18.
 Śabara *p.* 3.
 Śama 16, 68.
 Śarmamitra 14.
 Śavara *p.* 3, 65.
 Śakya 8, 11, 67.
 Śakya *d.* 45.
 Śakyāmāna 51.
 Śakyamuni vii.
 Śakyasimha vii.
 Śatakarni 36-43, 71, 72.
 Śatikarṇa 37.
 Śāntakarni 39.
 Śāntikarṇa 37.
 Śāliśūka 27, 29, 70, 84; xx.
 †Śipraka 38, 71.
 Śivakhada 37.
 Śivaśrī 36, 37, 42, 71, 81.
 Śivaskanda, °dha 36, 42, 71.
 Śivasvāti 36, 42, 71.
 Śivasvāmin 42.
 Śiśika 49.
 Śiśuka (1) 38, 71: (2) 49, 50, 73.
 †Śiśunāka 19, 21-23, 80.
 †Śiśunāka *d.* 22, 23, 80.
 Śiśunāga 21, 68, 69, 80.
 Śiśunāga *d.* 20-23, 80; xix.
 Śiśunandi 49, 73.
 Śukra 49, 50.
 Śukra *planet* 57.
 †Śuṅka *d.* 30, 49, 80.
 Śuṅga *d.* 27, 28, 30-34, 38, 49, 50, 70, 71, 73, 80, 85; xix.
 Śuṅgabhṛtya *d.* 33, 34, 71, 85.
 Śuci 15, 67.
 Śucidraṭha 6, 66.
 Śuciratha 6.
 Śuddhoda 11.
 Śuddhodana 8, 11, 67; vii.
 Śuddhaudana 11.
 Śumaka 18, 68.
 Śuśrūma 16.

- Śūdra *p.* 54, 74.
 śūdra *caste* 2, 8, 23, 25, 54, 55, 65, 69, 74.
 Śūra *p.* 54, 55, 74.
 Śūrasena *d.* 24, 69.
 †Śrūga *d.* 32, 34, 38, 39.
 Śeśika *p.* 54.
 Śeṣa 49, 72.
 Śaiśara *p.* 51, 54.
 Śaiśika, °ja *p.* 54, 73.
 Śaiśita *p.* 54, 73.
 †Śaiśunāka *d.* 22, 23.
 Śaiśunāga *d.* 22, 69.
 Śauniga 71.
 Śaunaka *b.* 4.
 Śauśita *p.* 54.
 Śrīpārvatiya *d.* 44, 46, 72.
 Śrī-Mallakarni 39.
 Śrī-Śatakarni 36, 37, 39, 71.
 Śrī-Śāntakarni, °na 39.
 Śrutāñjaya 15, 67.
 Śrutavant 14, 67.
 Śrutāśravas 14, 67.
 Śrutasena 4.

 Sāmpadi 29.
 Sāngata 29.
 Sāṅgha ? 40.
 Sāñjaya 11, 67.
 Sati 37.
 Satyajit 17, 67.
 Sada 37.
 Sadakani 37.
 Sadakhada ? 37.
 Sadācandra 49, 72.
 Sadānika 7.
 sapta xxiii.
 †Saptaka 41, 71.
 Saptajit ? 17.
 Saptarṣi *constell. and cycle* 59-62; xv.
 Sama 16.
 Samakarni 42, 43.
 samā xxiii.
 Samādhi 14.
 Samābhāga ? 32, 70.
 Samudragupta xii, xiii.

 Samprati 28, 29, 70.
 Sarvajit 17.
 †Salomadhi 43.
 Sahadeva (1) 10, 66: (2) 10, 66: (3) 14, 67.
 Sahalya 25, 69.
 sahasrāṇi xxvi.
 Sahasrāṇika 4.
 †Sahānandi 22, 69.
 Sāketa, °tu *t.* 53, 73; xii.
 Sākṣonāmān ? 51.
 Sāñchi *t.* 48.
 Satakani 37.
 Sātavāhana 37.
 Sāmakarni 42, 43.
 Sāmādhi 14.
 Siddhārtha 9, 11, 67.
 Sindhu *r.* 55, 74.
 Sindhuka 38, 71.
 Simuka 36-38, 71, 81; xxvi.
 Siri-mata 37.
 Siri Yaśa 37.
 Sirivira 37.
 Sivamakhā 37.
 Sivasir 42.
 Sukalpa 25, 69.
 Sukulpa, °lya 25.
 Sukṛta 15, 67.
 Sukṣatra (1) 10: (2) 15, 67.
 Sukhābala 6, 66.
 Sukhinandi 49.
 Sukhibala, °nala 6, 66.
 Sukhīlava 6.
 Sukheṇa 6.
 Suṅgaśrī 43.
 Sucāla 16, 68.
 Sujyestha 31, 70, 81.
 Sutapas (1) 6, 66: (2) 10, 66.
 Sutirtha 6.
 Sudānaka 7, 66.
 Sudāsa 7, 66.
 †Sudeva 33.
 Sudyumna 2, 65.
 Sudyota 18.
 Sudhanvan 16.
 Sudharman 34.

 Sun 57, 74.
 Sunakṣatra (1) 10, 66: (2) 15, 67.
 Sunandana 41.
 Sunaya 6, 7, 66.
 Sunika 18, 68.
 Sunidharma *d.* 3, 65.
 Sunita ? 17, 68.
 Sunitha (1) 6, 66: (2) 17, 68.
 Sunetra (1) 16, 67: (2) 16: (3) 17, 68.
 Sundara 36, 41, 71.
 Sundhara 41.
 Suparṇa 10, 66.
 Suprañita 10.
 Supratāpa 10.
 Supratika (1) 10, 66: (2) 50, 73.
 Supratita 10, 66.
 Supratipa 10, 66.
 Subāla 16, 68.
 Sumati (1) 16, 68: (2) 26.
 Sumātya 26, 69.
 Sumālya 25, 26, 69.
 Sumitra (1) 10, 67: (2) 12, 67: (3) 15: (4) 31.
 Suyaśas 27-29, 70.
 Surakṣa 16, 67.
 Suratha (1) 7: (2) 8, 11, 12, 67.
 Surāṣṭra *c.* 54.
 Suruṇḍa *d.* 46, 47.
 †Suloman 42.
 Suvata 16.
 Suvarṇa 10, 66.
 Suvidratha 6.
 Suvrata (1) 13, 16, 67: (2) 16, 68: (3) 11.
 Suśarman 34, 38, 71; xx.
 Suśrama 13, 16, 68.
 Suśruta 16.
 Suśinandi 49, 73.
 Suśeṇa (1) 6, 66: (2) 10, 66, 82.
 Suhma *c.* 54.
 sūta xi.

INDEX

97

- | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Sūrya 9. | Somāpi, °mi 14, 67. | Svātivarṇa 36, 40, 71. |
| Sūryaka 19, 68. | Saudyumna <i>race</i> 2. | Svātiṣeṇa 40. |
| Sūrya-vaṁśa 58. | Saurāṣṭra <i>p.</i> 54, 55, 74. | |
| Sṛtañjaya 15. | Skandasyāti 36, 40, 71. | Hari 7, 66. |
| Senajit 11, 67. | Skandhastambhi 36, 39, 71. | Haritāśva c. 2. |
| Senājit 5, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17, | †Strimitra <i>d.</i> 51. | Hastināpura <i>t.</i> 5, 65 ; v. |
| 67 ; ix. | Strirājya, °rāṣṭra 54, 74. | Hāla 36, 41, 71, 85. |
| Seven Rṣis 75. | Svasphraka <i>d.</i> 3, 65. | Hāleya 41, 86. |
| Soma-vaṁśa 12, 58. | Svāti 36, 40, 71, 81. | Hūṇa <i>d.</i> 45-47, 72 ; xxv. |
| Somaśarman 29. | Svātikarṇa 37, 40, 71. | Haihaya <i>d.</i> 23, 69, 77. |
| Somādi, °dhi 14, 67. | Svātikona 37, 40. | |

Skylark Printers

K 2/8 MODEL TOWN DELHI - 9



1192



